NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCV.

AUGUST, 1890.

OUR ARMY AND MILITIA.

BY GENERAL WILLIAM T. SHERMAN.

FIFTY years ago, when I was a cadet at West Point, a bright young lad came from his fond parents, as fresh and innocent as a lamb, duly appointed to dedicate his life to the glorious cause of his country, and to receive the necessary instruction at that national school. He passed through the usual ordeal of admission, and at a suitable moment applied to the commandant of the new cadets with the question, "What must I do to excel in my profession?" He received the blunt answer, "Obey orders." The sequel was that he graduated in the following January, went back to his home, studied law, rose in his profession, and became a judge in one of the United States courts in a western territory.

There is no doubt that to "obey orders" is a large factor in the problem of military life, because subordination to lawful authority is the bond which holds together the parts which compose all armies, and makes them powerful instruments for good deeds; but something more is required. There must be some to give orders; and it is for these that instruction is chiefly needed.

In every profession is found an epitome of the knowledge requisite for success. Every religious denomination furnishes a "*vade mecum*" which teaches the believer what he must do to be saved; but the military profession offers only the articles of war, which amount to "You'll be damned if you do, and you'll be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

damned if you don't"—nothing to answer my friend's inquiry what he should do to *excel* in his profession. The task is a difficult one; yet it must be undertaken, and military men should undertake it, because it is their exclusive business.

There can be no question that recorded history illustrates the science of war better than any abstract treatise, because what men have done in the past they may do again, and every army contemplates the use of physical force to achieve some result at the least cost of life and treasure and with the largest promise of success; but the study of recorded history is too long, too complicated and massive, to be undertaken by the common officer or soldier; therefore condensation is necessary, if not imperative.

Say what we may of the immortal part, man is at best an intellectual and combative animal, and the history of the world is chiefly made up of wars—conflicts of self-interest or opinion. The Bible on which is founded modern religion—"Peace on earth and good-will to men"—records the deeds of military heroes, of bloody battles and fearful slaughter; and subsequent histories are full of war, its deeds and alarms. Yet philosophy and experience teach that each century has brought about an amelioration. Statesmen, lawyers, and doctors of all degrees find germs of the modern professions in the examples of Greece and Rome; while many good soldiers believe that brave men and skilful generals "lived before Agamemnon," and find in the Greek phalanx and Roman legion the counterparts of the modern battalion and *corps d'armée*.

My own reading and experience, however, convince me that modern governments and modern armies have their origin in the so-called dark or middle ages, between the downfall of the Roman Empire and the discovery of America—a period of a thousand years of fermentation, resulting in great good to the mass of mankind. Students of the military profession may therefore safely begin with the chronicles of the middle ages, "England, France, Spain, and Adjoining Countries," 1320–1461, by Sir John Froissart—a book of world-wide renown, which is filled with graphic accounts of the deeds of the knights-errant, and from which Walter Scott has drawn largely in his "Ivanhoe" and "Quentin Durward." Froissart's "Chronicles" are more valuable to the military student by reason of the faithful description of the habits, customs, and thoughts of that period than for the record of indi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vidual feats of arms; and from them can be traced many of the usages and customs which now prevail in all armies.

Gunpowder was known to the Chinese as early as the year 80 of the Christian era, and the knowledge of its destructive powers passed to India, Persia, and Africa, whence the Moors carried it into Spain and used it in sieges as early as 1238, though the world generally gives to Berthold Schwartz, of Germany, the credit of its discovery about 1330.

The battle of Crécy, August, 1346, between the English and French, marks the first recorded use of gunpowder in a field battle; it enabled a few thousand English to rout and destroy four-fold their own number of valiant knights, and absolutely revolutionized the whole art of war as then practised. Among the first instruments used were cannon, smooth-bores and breech-loaders, soon followed by the arquebus and rampart gun with a tripod, or "rest," fired from the shoulder, with a pad to distribute the shock. The bullets, or projectiles, were of stone, iron, lead, or some other metal; samples of which are common in the arsenals of Europe and America.

At all events, in that century the knight in steel armor, with bow, lance, and spear, gave place to the musketeer, and the barons with their retainers made way for the regular captains, lieutenants, sergeants, corporals, and privates, all bound by oath to serve their sovereign for specific periods, and with regular pay and allowances.

In that epoch of transition there lived in Europe great men, great statesmen, great scholars, great soldiers. I need recall no name other than that of Shakespeare, who lived in England from 1564 to 1616, whose knowledge of the human heart and brain, and whose comprehension of the motives which impel human action, have never been equalled in these modern times, with all their inventions and all their professions of superior knowledge. Shakespeare referred to gunpowder in his "Henry IV.," wherein he makes *Harry Percy* say (Part I., Act I., Scene 3):

> "It was great pity, so it was,
> That villanous saltpetre should be digg'd
> Out of the bowels of the harmless earth,
> Which many a good tall fellow had destroy'd
> So cowardly; and but for these vile guns,
> He would himself have been a soldier."

If any of the present generation flatter themselves that they are better and wiser than their ancestors, let them read Shakespeare;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

also the second chapter of Dr. Draper's "Intellectual Development of Europe," Volume II., wherein it is demonstrated that learned Moors brought algebra and the mathematical sciences into Spain centuries before Columbus was born, had measured on the shores of the Red Sea the exact length of a degree of the earth's meridian and the obliquity of the ecliptic, and knew enough of astronomy to prove the rotundity of the earth. While the professors of England, France, Italy, and Germany were teaching that the earth's surface was flat, the Spanish Moors were teaching geography in their common schools from globes. Nevertheless, the modern world was not yet ready for the refined, superior civilization of the Asiatics.

In the fifteenth century occurred three great events—the application of gunpowder to the uses of war; the invention of printing; and the practical discovery of America. Gunpowder gave rise to the modern science of war; printing to the universal dissemination of knowledge; and America gave room for the then overcrowded, discontented, and adventurous population of Europe. Out of that chaotic period the present states of Europe crystallized, resulting in clearly-defined boundaries of territory, the population of each state similar in language, manners, and customs, and each governed by a sovereign, a parliament, and a judiciary.

The reign of Louis XIV. of France, "*le grand monarque*," 1638—1715, was rich in brilliant men and great events. Two famous soldiers, the Prince of Condé and Turenne, graced this period. The former has left us some wise advice, which may well be pondered by every young officer and soldier:

"There are some things which a young man is absolutely obliged to know when first he goes to the wars, and some others which he may be ignorant of without any reflection upon his honor. He must know he is bound to respect all his superiors, to be civil to his equals, to be courteous to all officers, and to have charity for all those under his command. But this charity must not extend so far as to slacken in obliging them to perform their duty to the full, for he can never be too severe on that point. The knowledge of these matters will prevent his falling into many errors. He cannot fail in point of respect to his superiors without being reprimanded, and perhaps punished, because all generals take care that every man have his due, not according to his own birth, but to his post. Therefore a young gentleman must not think that because he is of great quality he can pay the less respect to a soldier of fortune; he will never be in the wrong in giving him all manner of honor, and should he fail in that particular, he will be compelled to it. In the next place, if he is civil to his equals, all men will value him, for civility wins the heart, whereas everybody hates pride. Thirdly, if he is courtly to all the officers, they will all speak well of him, and he may hope to advance his fortune that way, as well

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as by his brave actions; reputation in war being as necessary as any other thing. Lastly, if he has charity for all under his command, he must certainly be beloved, which will be no small advantage to him, for soldiers never forsake an officer they love upon action; and he gains much honor by their sticking close to him; whereas those who are hated by their men are often abandoned by them, and thus shamefully disgraced, soldiers sometimes preferring their revenge before their honor."

"As for the lieutenant, he ought to know full as much as a captain, his duty being almost the same. He is often detached to command a party in chief, or a guard that might be a captain's, and, having nobody there to advise with, he must have experience; for, wanting it, the consequences may be fatal. I have seen lieutenants committed to the provost for having behaved themselves like mere novices in the fight. Therefore I would never advise a young man to be a lieutenant at first, because, being a lieutenant, there will not be so much connivance towards him as if he was a cornet. Besides, all the troops depend on him and the quartermaster; so that if the troopers once discover his weakness, which certainly they will, they will neither value nor respect him; and it were better for him to be no officer than to be so contemned. Besides, his ill name will soon spread throughout the whole army, the common discourse of troopers being about their officers, whom they extol to the very skies if they value them, and run them down as fast if they undervalue them. In short, if a man would have an account of any officer, he need only set his troopers' tongues a-running upon that subject, and they will tell him all the good or harm they know with unspeakable ingenuity."

Every word of this is as true to-day as when it was written two hundred years ago. At that date the battalion was composed of an even number of companies, and these were grouped into brigades, divisions, and armies.

The unit, or common soldier, was without armor, clothed for protection against the weather, and armed with the match-lock, a muzzle-loader, with ball or buckshot, and fired by a match brought to the pan of powder by his own hand or by a simple trigger, such as was used by the Chinese up to a recent period. Any soldier of to-day, regular or volunteer, will recognize the following picture. The manual for loading and firing the musket in 1707 was:

"Join your right hands to your muskets: Handle your matches: Blow your matches: Try your matches: Guard your pans: Blow your matches: Present: Give fire: Recover your arms: Return your matches: Blow your pans: Handle your primers: Prime: Shut your pans: Blow your pans: Cast about to charge: Handle your charges: Open them with your teeth: Charge with powder: Charge with bullet: The wads from your hats: Draw forth your rammers: Hold them up: Shorten them against your breast: Put them in the barrels: Ram down your charge: Withdraw your rammers: Hold them up: Shorten them against your breasts: Return your rammers: Your right hand under the pan: Poise your muskets: Shoulder your muskets: Rest your muskets: Order your muskets: Lay down your muskets: Take up your muskets: Rest your muskets: Club your muskets: Rest your muskets: Shoulder your muskets: Make ready: Present: Give fire."

In 1779 was published in America the volume of Baron Steuben's tactics, which contains the manual of arms for our

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Revolutionary army. The musket was then a flint-lock muzzle-loader, with single ball or ball and buckshot, effective at about one hundred yards, with a recoil as dangerous to the soldier as to the object aimed at. For firing and loading the commands were, the musket being loaded and at a shoulder: "Poise fire-lock: Cock fire-lock: Take aim: Fire." "Half cock fire-lock: Handle cartridge: Prime: Shut pan: Charge with cartridge: Draw rammer: Ram down cartridge: Return rammer: Shoulder fire-lock."

Up to 1840 we had the same old flint-lock, smooth-bore musket with paper cartridges, and loaded by twelve commands: "Load: Open pan: Handle cartridge: Tear cartridge: Prime: Shut pan: Cast about: Charge cartridge: Draw ramrod: Ram cartridge: Return ramrod: Shoulder arms."

About 1845 the percussion cap, previously used by sportsmen, was adapted to the smooth-bore muzzle-loader, and it was loaded in "*ten* times" or motions; gradually reduced to four motions, and finally to one: "Load at will."

Now, in 1890, every recruit knows that he can load his rifle and fire it from five to twenty times a minute, thereby exhausting his supply of sixty rounds in a few minutes, whereas as late as our Civil War forty rounds in the cartridge-box and twenty in the haversack were a full allowance for a day's fighting. To supply an army engaged in battle will henceforth tax the supply train, for it is well known that recruits measure a battle by its noise, whereas the veteran measures it by the effect; hence the increased value of experience. There are hundreds of most valuable patents for modern rifles; and in this connection I will only venture the statement that the invention of the metallic cartridge was the parent of all, and that the mechanism of the breech is of less importance than the accurate preparation of the barrel.

Meantime, corresponding changes have occurred in cannon from the original bars of iron held in place by rings, to the mortar, howitzer, field and siege guns, sea-coast and naval guns, all of them rifled and some of them so heavy that steam or hydraulic power is required to load and fire them. Armor plates of steel twenty inches thick are used to protect the vital parts of ships, and even the gunners. It seems to me that, no matter how powerful naval guns may be fabricated, our land guns, resting on the solid earth, can be built stronger, while steam and hydraulic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power may raise the gun, fire with precision, and lower away behind the invulnerable earth; so that the old ratio is not changed, that five guns on land are equal to a hundred afloat.

Anything which attempts to limit danger to person in war is a mistake. In my judgment, the engine of a man-of-war should be protected as far as possible by armor, but the fighting-decks and bulwarks should be thin, so as to encourage the shot to go through as quickly as possible. The same of our sea-coast forts. A few twelve-inch rifles at the salients bearing on sea channels, with steel casemates, an abundance of cheaper ten- or fifteen-inch barbette or embrasure guns, with spherical cast-iron shot well handled, supplemented by entanglements and torpedoes, will make our chief seaports comparatively safe against any modern fleet.

The progress made in naval and seacoast guns in the last twenty-five years has been very great, and the establishments for their manufacture have kept pace with the demand. These guns and this ammunition are very costly and will add largely to the expenditures of the next war. They also demand much time in their fabrication, and therefore a supply should be obtained and stored where needed. In like manner, field guns should be provided in advance and stored in the usual arsenals. A new army requires as many as six guns to a thousand men, but after experience these may be reduced to three or even one, as was the case in my long march from Atlanta to Raleigh in 1864–'65.

The cavalry of the world have probably passed through more transitions than the infantry and artillery. They are the immediate successors to the knights templars. They have discarded the casque, cuirass, and coat of mail, rendered useless by the modern pistol and carbine, and they dress like other soldiers, only clinging to their horses and sabres. They take their place in line of battle usually on the flanks, often detached as "the eyes of the army." They can make a circuit of forty or fifty miles a day, while the infantry and artillery plod their fifteen or twenty; but in a march of a thousand miles, as is recorded of Alexander the Great, the infantry arrive first. A man is a more perfect animal than a horse. He can live on two pounds of food a day, whereas the horse and rider must have twenty; therefore in all times, ancient and modern, the infantry have composed—and they will continue to compose—the great mass of all armies. The chief use of the cavalry in a modern army is to supply information;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to watch flank movements; to fight on foot, and, when the enemy is in retreat, to pursue and gather the fruits of victory.

Having thus rapidly sketched the three "arms" into which all modern armies are resolved, I now desire to give my readers the benefit of some personal thoughts and experiences in partial answer to the question, "What must an army officer do to excel in his profession?"

We all know what he must *not* do; and the real question is what he should do.

The army of the United States is older than the present government, some of the companies antedating the Revolutionary War. It has always been officered by men of marked ability, whose examples are the precious inheritance of their successors. They have been the advance-guard in the settlement and civilization of this continent. Therefore I say to the young officer, Attend with scrupulous fidelity to the duties of the garrison or post to which you are assigned, with the assurance that these duties are based on the experience of your predecessors, as good men as yourselves, and no better. The government provides the officer and soldier with reasonable liberality, so that they must not embark in trade, business, or speculation; for a man cannot be a good soldier if his thoughts and interests are elsewhere. The condition of the junior officers and enlisted men of our army has been largely improved. They are better paid, better clad, have better food and infinitely better quarters, than fifty years ago.

Railroads have obliterated the old frontiers with their long and dangerous routes of supply, and the telegraph has superseded the long courier lines which cost the government many fine horses and mules, and many a brave fellow his life.

As to the subaltern, I repeat that he must devote his whole time to his daily duties and to his studies, which will the better prepare him for the accidents of war that always come suddenly and unexpectedly, especially in this country; and, above all, he must never harbor a thought of doubt as to the allegiance due to his government and the officers appointed to administer it. With its politics he has nothing to do whatever.

There is no doubt that this world has been undergoing a series of changes, physical and intellectual, according to some law not yet discovered, and that it is sometimes disturbed by aberrations such as happen to light, electricity, and the motions of the planets;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

yet generally the world moves in a direction of "betterment." Nations, like individuals, have had their birth, youth, manhood, old age, and death; to be succeeded by others with larger proportions, generally with better opportunities to indulge in liberty of thought and action, the enjoyment of their inheritance, and the fruits of their own labor.

To this class of men the discovery of America gave great stimulus, and the facility of spreading news by means of the art of printing made the exodus from Europe universal, resulting in many colonies of every type and kind of people more or less independent of the states from which they had come and of each other; yet all obeying the general law that like races come together for mutual protection and social advantage.

Every army officer is now required to know the history of his own country and of its institutions, of the colonies, of the War of Independence, the subsequent war with Great Britain, the Mexican War and the Civil War, all of which were conflicts of arms made necessary by social and political causes, all resulting in a step forward; and he further knows that *his country* extends 3,000 miles from the Atlantic to the Pacific, 1,000 miles from the lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, wholly within the best latitudes for civilization—latitudes producing the types of men of the largest physical and mental strength, possessing the largest measure of liberty ever enjoyed by any people on earth, and therefore most liable to civil convulsions. We have no personal sovereign: our sovereignty remains with the people, whose will may be theoretically ascertained by fair means under a written constitution, symbolized by a common flag known the world over as the "Stars and Stripes," with the motto "*E Pluribus Unum*"—one nation composed of forty-four States, each with exact boundaries, and with powers as clearly defined as can be done by words.

Under this system, though wrong may be done to individuals and even to communities for a time, tyranny and oppression are impossible. With us, as with all other governments, monarchical or imperial, the actual administration is subdivided into legislative, judicial, and executive. These may at times create a conflict with each other, but there is less liability of it with us than under any other form of government. Yet as every court must have its marshal or sheriff, so must every State and the general government have an armed force to compel obedience to its de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crees. On this branch of the subject there can be no better authority than the Constitution itself, the judgments of the Supreme Court, and the precepts of Washington.

Army officers cannot be expected to follow all the decisions of the Supreme Court, but they may easily master the two volumes of Bancroft's "History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States," published in January, 1882, which describe with great precision the confusion that prevailed in the old Continental Congress during the Revolutionary War, the utter failure of the confederation of the thirteen colonies, with all their impracticable prejudices and diverse interests, and the final adoption of our present Constitution, of which Mr. Gladstone has written: "As the British Constitution is the most subtile organism which has proceeded from progressive history, so the American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

By our Constitution the power to declare war, create an army or navy, make rules for the government of the land and naval forces, call forth the militia, etc., is committed to the national Congress, and when these forces are called into the service of the United States, the President becomes the commander-in-chief thereof. Of course he cannot be expected to command in person a navy on the high seas or an army in the field: these duties must be committed to subordinates, and it is to these subordinates that I address this paper.

During our Civil War many a young lieutenant became a colonel, brigadier, major-general, corps or army commander, in one, two, and three years, without a book save the "Army Regulations"; and hundreds, if not thousands, commanded detachments, with power over life and death, with little knowledge of the great laws of war. Of the valuable treatises on this subject I always prefer that of "The Rights of War and Peace," by Hugo Grotius (born in Holland), translated into English and published in London, 1738—a book which ought to be found in every good library. Every army officer should make Grotius his text-book, just as every lawyer makes Coke and Blackstone his.

In time of war the armies of the United States are rightfully and lawfully invested with extraordinary powers, always subject to the national government, and in time of peace, being composed of citizens, they are further subject and subordinate to the civil

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

code of the locality; but when the storm comes, when Congress, the Supreme Court, and the President are defied, insulted, and maligned, as occurred in 1861, then comes in that new, but long-existent, code of war; and it is to the interest of every citizen of the United States that the army officers should be not only honest and patriotic, but intelligent and learned enough to understand the nature of the power thus imposed on them. No officer of the United States army has ever questioned or ever will question the fundamental principles of our Constitution; but when the Congress has declared war, has provided the ways and means, and the President, as constitutional commander-in-chief, has indicated the measures, then the soldier goes in with confidence to restore *peace*. Of these measures the commanding officer on the spot must often be the sole judge. The law then becomes the law of war, and not of peace.

In England and America there exists a jealousy of the military power totally unwarranted by the facts of history. In the past century of most exciting events in our country, the military has never attempted usurpation. It achieved our independence in 1781; it asserted and maintained all our rights as an independent power on land and on the high seas in 1812; promptly crushed nullification in 1831–'32; extended our territorial limits to the Pacific in 1846–'48; and in 1861–'65 settled *forever* the dangerous doctrine that a State could secede from the Union at its own will without the consent of the aggregate whole—the nation. The military code is as much the law of the land as the law merchant, and is now so recognized by the Supreme Court of the United States. Courts-martial are statutory courts of record, as much as are the district courts of the United States; the only question being, "Does lawful war or peace prevail at the place and time of the cause of action?"

In the case of Pryor N. Coleman *vs.* the State of Tennessee, in the October (1878) term of the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice Field delivered the opinion of the court.

"This case comes before us from the Supreme Court of Tennessee. The plaintiff in error, the defendant in the court below, was indicted in the criminal court for the district of Knox County in that State on the 2d of October, 1874, for the murder of Mourning Ann Bell, alleged to have been committed in that county on the 7th of March, 1865. To this indictment he pleaded not guilty, and a former conviction for the same offence by a general court-martial regularly convened at Knoxville, Tennessee, on the 27th of March, 1865; the United States at that time, and when the offence was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

committed, occupying with their armies east Tennessee as a military district, and the defendant being a regular soldier in their military service, subject to the articles of war, military orders, and such military laws as were then in force by their authority. The plea states that before the said court-martial thus convened at Knoxville, then the headquarters of the military district, the defendant was arraigned upon a charge of murder in having killed the same person named in the indictment, and that he was afterwards, on the 9th of May, 1865, tried and convicted of the offence by that tribunal and sentenced to death by hanging, and that the said sentence is still standing as the judgment of the court-martial, approved as required by law in such cases without other or further action thereon. In consideration of the premises, and by reason of the said trial and conviction, and of the jeopardy involved in said proceedings, the defendant prays that the indictment may be quashed. . . .

"During the Civil War, Congress enacted that in time of war, in districts occupied by the armies of the United States, the fifty-eighth article of war should be extended to the crimes of murder, assault and battery with intent to kill, manslaughter, mayhem, wounding by shooting or stabbing with intent to commit murder, robbery, arson, burglary, rape," etc., etc.

Judge Field in this case proceeds :

"Previous to its [fifty-eighth article of war] enactment the offences designated were punishable by the State courts, and persons in the military service who committed them were delivered over to these courts for trial. . . . We do not mean to intimate that it was not within the competency of Congress to confer exclusive jurisdiction upon military courts over offences committed by persons in the military service."

The final decree was

"that the judgment of the Supreme Court of Tennessee must be reversed, and the cause remanded with directions to discharge the defendant from custody by the sheriff of Knox County on the indictment and conviction for murder in the State court. But as the defendant was guilty of murder, as clearly appears not only by the evidence in the record in this case, but in the record of the proceedings of the court-martial,—a murder committed, too, under circumstances of great atrocity,—and he was convicted of that crime by that court and sentenced to death, and it appears by his plea that said judgment was duly approved, and still remains without any action having been taken upon it, he may be delivered up to the military authorities of the United States to be dealt with as required by law."

And the prisoner was delivered into the custody of the military authorities, his sentence was modified by the President to imprisonment for life, and he is, I believe, so imprisoned at the Albany Penitentiary, New York.

Recurring to General George Washington, the fountain-source of so much that is distinctively American, I find that under date of September 24, 1776, he wrote from the Heights of Harlem :

"From the hours devoted to sleep I will borrow a few moments to convey my thoughts on sundry important matters to Congress. . . .

"The jealousy of a standing army and the evils to be apprehended from one are remote and, in my judgment, situated and circumstanced as we are, not at all to be dreaded ; but the consequence of wanting one, according to my ideas formed from the present view of things, is certain and inevitable ruin. For if I was called upon to declare upon oath whether the militia have been most serviceable or hurtful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon the whole, I should subscribe to the latter. . . . But experience, which is the best criterion to work by, so fully, clearly, and decisively reprobates the practice of trusting to militia that no man who regards order, regularity, and economy, or who has any regard for his own honor, character, or peace of mind, will risk them upon this issue."

And again from Valley Forge, April 21, 1778, he wrote to John Banister, delegate in Congress:

"Before I conclude, there are one or two points more upon which I will add an observation or two. The first is the indecision of Congress and the delay used in coming to determinations on matters referred to them. This is productive of a variety of inconveniences; and an early decision, in many cases, though it should be against the measure submitted, would be attended with less pernicious effects. Some new plan might then be tried; but, while the matter is held in suspense, nothing can be attempted. The other point is the *jealousy* which Congress unhappily entertain of the army, and which, if reports are right, some members labor to establish. You may be assured there is nothing more injurious or more unfounded. . . .

"The distinction, the jealousies set up, or perhaps only incautiously let out, can answer not a single good purpose. They are impolitic in the extreme. Among individuals the most certain way to make a man your enemy is to tell him that you esteem him such. So with public bodies; and the very jealousy which the narrow politics of some may affect to entertain of the army, in order to a due subordination to the supreme civil authority, is a likely means to produce a contrary effect; to incline it to the pursuit of those measures which they may wish it to avoid. It is unjust, because no order of men in the thirteen States has paid a more sacred regard to the proceedings of Congress than the army; for without arrogance, or the smallest deviation from truth, it may be said that no history now extant can furnish an instance of an army's suffering such uncommon hardships as ours has done, and bearing them with the same patience and fortitude. . . .

"There may have been some remonstrances or applications to Congress, in the style of complaint from the army (and slaves indeed should we be if this privilege were denied) on account of their proceedings in certain instances; but these will not authorize nor even excuse a jealousy that they are therefore aiming at unreasonable powers, or making strides dangerous or subversive of civil authority. Things should not be viewed in that light, more especially as Congress in some cases have relieved the injuries complained of, which had flowed from their own acts.

"In respect to the volunteer plan, I scarce know what opinion to give at this time. The propriety of a requisition on this head will depend altogether on our operations. Such kind of troops should not be called for but upon the spur of the occasion, and at the moment of executing an enterprise. They will not endure a long service; and of all men in the military line they are the most impatient of restraint and necessary government."

Washington loved order and system, and consequently held the militia and even volunteers in low esteem; but he always favored a *well-regulated* militia, like our modern State guard, as auxiliary to the national or regular army. In his speech to Congress, November 19, 1794, he uses this language:

"It ought not to be forgotten that the militia laws have exhibited such striking defects as could not have been supplied but by the zeal of our citizens. The devising and establishing of a well-regulated militia would be a genuine source of legislative honor and a perfect title to public gratitude. I therefore entertain a hope that the present session will not pass without carrying to its full energy the power of organ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

izing armies and disciplining the militia, and thus providing, in the language of the Constitution, for calling them forth to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions."

Again, December 7, 1796, in the last address he made personally to Congress, he said :

"My solicitude to see the militia of the United States placed on an efficient establishment has been so often and so ardently expressed that I shall but barely recall the subject to your view on the present occasion, at the same time that I shall submit to your inquiry whether our harbors are yet sufficiently secured."

And, finally, in that same speech he laid the foundation for the Military Academy at West Point. In response to his advice, Congress has generally been liberal to the Military Academy, but for some reason the "well-regulated militia" has been sadly neglected. These now number 8,104,028 men, of whom not one in the hundred is armed, equipped, and organized, or even professes the least knowledge of the art of war. Of course Congress can do no wrong ; but surely, a whole century having passed since the Father of Our Country gave such admirable advice, there has been neglect somewhere.

Let me here quote from the Revised Statutes of the United States the present law of the land :

"Section 1625. Every able-bodied male citizen of the respective States, resident therein, who is of the age of eighteen years, and under the age of forty-five years, shall be enrolled in the militia."

"Section 1628. Every citizen shall, after notice of his enrolment, be constantly provided with a good musket or fire-lock, of a bore sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound, a sufficient bayonet and belt, two spare flints, and a knapsack, a pouch, with a box therein, to contain not less than twenty-four cartridges suited to the bore of his musket or fire-lock, each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball, or with a good rifle, knapsack, shot-pouch, and powder-horn, twenty balls suited to the bore of his rifle, and a quarter of a pound of powder, and shall appear so armed, accoutred, and provided when called out to exercise or into service. . . . Each commissioned officer shall be armed with a sword or hanger and spontoon."

"Section 1632. . . . The officers [of cavalry] should be armed with sword or hanger, a fusee, bayonet, and belt, with a cartridge-box to contain twelve cartridges. . . . Each dragoon shall furnish himself with a serviceable horse, at least fourteen and a half hands high, a good saddle, bridle, mail-pillion, and valise, holsters, and a breast-plate and crupper," etc.

I do not believe there are a dozen officers in the New York militia who know what a spontoon or mail-pillion is, and any captain of the 7th Regiment would swear worse than *Falstaff* if he were compelled to march his company down Broadway armed and equipped as the law provides. Yet all officers are supposed to obey the law and respect the law-makers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This antiquated and most ridiculous statute should be revised *in toto*, and the "law of the land" brought down to the present epoch. The regular army should be made, in organization, discipline, and equipment, the best possible; and the State guards should have identically the same organization, drill, uniform, and equipment, so as to constitute the reserve to the regular army, subject, of course, to State authority, but ready, as far as can be, if called into the service of the United States.

And inasmuch as the Constitution requires Congress to provide for calling forth the militia to "execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections, and repel invasions," and to "provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia," it is only just to the States and the young men who will compose this "well-regulated militia" that the cost of "organizing, arming, and disciplining" should be borne by the nation.

Of course it is simply impracticable for the general government to arm and equip the eight millions of "enrolled militia," but out of them can easily be organized, say, one man in each hundred of those at present subject to militia duty, to be distributed *pro rata* among the forty-four States. To these the national government should supply arms, equipment, tents, uniforms, and the same pay as regulars when called into active service, all moneys and properties to be receipted for and accounted for to the officers of the treasury; and these "*select militia*" should be subject to inspection by the officers of the Inspector-General's department of the national army.

The States will, as many do already, supplement the provisions of law by exempting the men from jury duty and militia tax; by providing them with armories, heated and lighted, transportation and pay while in camps of instruction, and other like advantages to encourage the young men, who have a natural fondness for military life, to embark in it. Such State troops will prove of infinite advantage to the States themselves, and in case of sudden necessity may be of infinite advantage to the national government.

In a report on army organization made by the Military Committee of the House of Representatives, February 26, 1869, is embodied the testimony of nearly every prominent officer who had served throughout the Civil War. It is entitled "Report No. 3, H. R., Fortieth Congress, Third Session." But more satisfactory to me are the two articles published in THE NORTH AMERI-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CAN REVIEW by General Garfield, before he became President, in the March–April number and that of May–June, 1878. Every army officer should possess these papers and study them closely.

I believe in the general principles of Senator Manderson's bill, which recognizes the three-battalion system as peculiarly suited to our country. All regiments, whether of infantry, artillery, or cavalry, should have three battalions of four companies in time of peace. If economy demands it, the third battalion may be reduced to a mere skeleton and utilized at a recruiting rendezvous, or as a guard to a fort or depot, and to the muster-rolls of the companies of this battalion might be transferred the names of officers absent from their professional duties at civil colleges, on signal and recruiting stations, and on the many demands for detached service. No military company liable to be called on at a minute's notice should have less than two commissioned officers, ten non-commissioned officers, and sixty privates. Allowing twenty-five enlisted men for the companies of the third, or reserve, battalion, there would be 29,600 enlisted men in all, or about the strength of one of our *corps d'armée* in the late war.

I prefer not to trespass further on the domain of Congress, as I know there are many members with ample experience who are likely to be on the military committees, who can reduce to the form of a bill the ideas I have endeavored, in the most general terms, to point out; and for these I would again emphasize the words of General Washington (already quoted) in his speech to Congress of November 19, 1794. How Congress has thus far responded to this noble appeal and aspiration can be inferred from Sections 1625, 1628, and 1632 of the present Revised Statutes of the United States, to which every officer and soldier are compelled to swear obedience. I, for one, will honor the member of Congress who will make even an effort to repeal these laws and substitute in their place others more in accordance with the spirit of the age.

This world is far from being finished. Many things have occurred in the past century which Washington did not foresee. During the next century many things will occur which President Harrison cannot foresee. But from the beginning good men have always sought "life, liberty, and happiness." For this purpose governments are established among men, and any government which fails to secure these must "perish from the earth." Now is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the time for the United States to so organize the machinery of government as to make these vital principles an actuality instead of a theory, and as our Constitution declares that a well-regulated militia is necessary to the security of a free state, I say, with the sailor, "Make it so." This work will give ample employment to the young aspirants of the next generation.

In this article I have purposely abstained from treating of general and staff officers. In my judgment, a good, well-managed garrison on the frontier, or anywhere, is the best possible school for generals, and even staff officers; and I shall regard it as a fatal mistake if the cavalry and artillery shall be withdrawn from the school of application at Fort Leavenworth, because the three arms of the service should be associated in daily duties, on drill, and on the march, so that when war compels them to be assembled in the same army, as must inevitably be the case, their habits will be already established. Out of these will come the natural leaders, who can select the necessary staff or assistants.

W. T. SHERMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIETY WOMEN BEFORE CHRIST.

BY GAIL HAMILTON.

PRINCIPAL DONALDSON, of St. Andrew's, an eminent Christian scholar, has startled the Christian world by recanting or recalling his belief that woman owes her present high position to Christianity. He finds that the first three centuries of Christianity, so far from having any favorable effect on women, tended to lower their character and contract the range of their activity.

Yet the world need not have been startled. Principal Donaldson himself is more surprised than the occasion requires. He confounds the Christianity of Christ with the Christianity of the church of the first three centuries. He admits that in the gospels no special doctrine was propounded with regard to women, while principles were uttered, influences were set astir, which mean ultimately the highest feminine development. It is subsequent churchmen who missed both principle and influence, gave a literal and misleading sense to words, and cramped the energy of woman to a narrow and degrading subjection.

If there lingers a doubt as to whether, on the whole, Christianity has improved women, we ought first to ascertain what were the character and position of the women whom Christianity found. By a rare combination of circumstances it happens that the leading women of pagandom's proudest era are as familiarly known to investigation as the leading women of Washington, of London, of Paris, in this last decade of the nineteenth century. The valley lands of many generations between are shrouded in impenetrable fog, but above the fog and beyond the intervale shines the glory of the Cæsars on their far mountain tops, and in its light we may still see the breathing forms of their beautiful women; the grace—and the grime—of their domestic life through the open doors of home.

If one were asked to name a group of representative men in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the sphere of politics, literature, government, war, for the culminating era of paganism, he could hardly fail to give the names of Sylla, Cæsar, Pompey, Cicero, Cato. The first of the imperial Cæsars, the great Julius, was born one hundred years before Christ. The world's birthday gift to him is the name of the seventh month of the year, and every man who dates a transaction in July swells the tribute of nineteen centuries to the Pontifex Maximus of pagandom. A priest of Jupiter at the age of fourteen, of an hereditary aristocracy that dared to proclaim descent not only from kings, but from the immortal gods, Julius Cæsar was endowed with every ability and eager for every accomplishment. Handsome, elegant, so fastidious in dress and manner that the luxurious drooping of his tunic fringes and the picturesque looping of his æsthetic girdle have defied the ravages of time, his rough countrymen saw but the finical exterior, and only the keen eyes of Sylla flashed warning to Rome to look sharp after the youngster with the artistic *ceinture*, for in him were met many Mariuses. Even Cicero, long afterwards, when Cæsar's ambition had so expanded and manifested itself as to menace his country, was baffled by the fine gentleman, and whimsically protested that he could not make him out. "I see in him an inclination for tyranny in all he projects and executes; but, on the other hand, when I see him arranging his hair so elaborately and scratching his head with one finger, I can hardly think he can conceive so fatal a design as the overthrow of the Republic." Orator, linguist, poet, author, and admirable in all before he was a soldier or statesman, Cæsar represents more than fairly the highest social achievement of Roman life, the highest physical refinement and mental culture of the civilization which we inherit.

Cæsar opened his eyes upon a society of which Sylla was the acknowledged head. A man of learning and letters as truly as a man of ferocious vengeance, a lover of the arts, a legislator, a statesman, a general, Sylla was as eager for books as he was for blood. When the boy Cato was wont to visit Sylla's house, he was horror-stricken at seeing there so many political victims that it seemed like a house of torture and execution. But when Sylla's son Faustus grew up and became business partner and personal friend of Rome's best lawyers, one of his pleasures was to be a near neighbor of Cicero in his luxurious country-house near Puteoli, on the Bay of Naples; and one of the attractions of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Faustus's home was the great library that he had inherited from his father. Here Cicero was free to burrow, and these treasured books he pictures himself as devouring in preference to the famous Puteoli oysters. It was a freedom which Cicero could all the better appreciate because he could gain access to the library in Sylla's day only by bribing the librarian, whereas Faustus permitted him not only to burrow, but to borrow.

Yet we must not be too severe even on Sylla. Book-lovers are not the most trustworthy folk in the world, and Cicero was a fervid book-lover. Moreover, it was a priceless library. It had originally belonged to Aristotle, who had beqeathed it to Theophrastus. That accomplished scholar had enlarged it with many contemporary works, including his own, which Cicero valued so highly that he could not invite Atticus to visit him without bidding him bring his Theophrastus with him. The heirs of Theophrastus, ignorant of its nature, but aware of its value, buried the treasure for safe keeping where it came near being ruined by damp and mildew. Discovered and rescued by the learned Apellikon, Sylla found it in Athens and brought it home, guarding it henceforth perhaps—and perhaps not—too jealously.

But what came by plunder went by poverty. Poor Faustus, plunged in debt, was obliged to put up public bills of sale, and Cicero, who could never miss his joke, remembering Sylla's long lists of Roman citizens proscribed for slaughter, came to his friend's defence against charges of extravagance and degeneracy with the pointed plea, "I like these bills much better than his father's."

Pompey, handsome, eloquent, sympathetic, brilliant, and beloved; Cato, priest, philosopher, patriot, reformer; Cicero, the man of genius with the temperament of genius, sincerest of Republicans, the dawn of a Christian conscience shedding over his pagan soul a light strong enough to give him the torment of vision, but not strong enough to minister the triumph of faith—these are great men not only of the ancient but of the modern world. It is to the wives of such men, it is in their relations with women of their own rank, that we must look for the highest character and the widest range which pagandom can furnish to woman.

At the age of sixteen Cæsar was betrothed, probably without his consent and against his liking, since immediately after the death of his father he dismissed the young lady and married Cor-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nelia, daughter of Cinna, colleague of Marius. Sylla was gravely displeased with the young man's choice. The exquisite garb, the hyacinthine locks, had not concealed from him the young dude's ambition or ability. He was already allied to Sylla's foes by the marriage of the rough-and-ready soldier-leader, Marius, to Cæsar's aunt Julia. Sylla had no mind to see the brightest and cleverest, even if the daintiest, young man of Rome throw himself completely into the arms of the enemy, and thus add to the strength of democracy the charms of aristocracy. With all Sylla's education, his art, his love of books, there was nothing in his view of the woman question to convince him that the situation was irretrievable. He simply and promptly ordered a divorce! The grief, the rights, the situation of the woman were not even considered. When the young husband refused to obey, he was treated like a criminal, unfrocked, deprived of all claim to his wife's dowry, to his own inheritance. Even his life was threatened, and he was saved only by swift flight and long concealment.

Such tribute the leader of Rome paid to the sacredness of marriage. On such heights stood woman in the most glorious era of pagandom.

The young wife died; but when Cæsar again thought of marriage, the political skies had changed. He had held firm to the Cinna marriage, and he now conciliated the Sylla faction by marrying Pompeia, the granddaughter of Sylla, and a kinswoman of Sylla's pet, Pompey the Great, then in the zenith of his popularity. It seems to have been from the beginning a marriage of politics, and not of affection. Pompeia was not beloved. And the political skies went on changing. The star of Sylla sank beneath the horizon, and the star of Cæsar mounted higher and higher. When all advantage that could spring from wedding Pompeia had been reaped, Cæsar's thoughts turned elsewhere. The plots of Sylla against Cæsar's Cornelia must seal the dead lips of Sylla against reproach, should Cæsar repudiate Pompeia. But it was not the dead that Cæsar regarded. It behooved him only to have a specious case to present to the living.

On one night in each year it was customary for the wife of the chief magistrate to celebrate in his house the worship of the Good Goddess, the especial deity of women. Even to the master his doors were closed, and he was fain to spend the night at some friend's house. When the service was to be held in Cæsar's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

house, Clodius, a reckless young scapegrace of the highest family, disguised himself in woman's clothes and gained entrance to the house. The gossip of Rome had it that he was carrying on a flirtation with Pompeia, but that Cæsar's mother, Aurelia, kept so strict a watch that Clodius was never able to visit Pompeia at home, and took this method to gain his end. While the maid who admitted him went to call Pompeia, Clodius wandered up and down, trying to keep away from the lights, and thus, a little frightened, no doubt, and clumsy in his novel garb and situation, attracted the attention of another maid, who asked him what he wanted. He replied that he was waiting for Abra (Pompeia's maid). A false note in his voice aroused the suspicion of his questioner, who drew him into the middle of the room, gave one startled stare at him, and ran to her mistress in a panic, screaming that there was a man in the house! Her mistress *chanced* to be Aurelia, Cæsar's mother and Pompeia's mother-in-law. Of course it was no "still hunt." Clodius tried to hide, but was found, recognized, and turned out of the house. The assembly was scattered, and all Rome was in an uproar.

Cæsar made short work of his part in the transaction. He divorced Pompeia. It is not certain that Pompeia knew of Clodius's plan, though it is possible. It is not certain or probable that Clodius, bad as he was, meant anything more than an impious and impudent frolic. It is not impossible or altogether improbable that Cæsar, Aurelia, and Clodius were in collusion against Pompeia. It is certain that, when Cæsar was called upon to testify at the trial of Clodius, he declared that he knew nothing of what was alleged against him! It is certain that, when Clodius afterwards became a candidate for high office, Cæsar, as chief magistrate,—let us say president,—took an active and successful part in furthering his election. But he immediately divorced Pompeia. And he could offer no better reason, saturated all through and through as he was with immorality, than the cruel sophism, "Cæsar's wife should be above suspicion."

The world has taken him at his word; has forgotten outraged Pompeia, has failed to discern in this glittering and sounding generality the base pretext of a man who was hunting for pretexts to divorce his wife, has accepted it, at Cæsar's own valuation, as the lofty requirement of a lofty soul!

I trust that Cæsar's moral nature has so far righted itself in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the spiritual world as to make him rejoice that his sin has found him out in this, even at so late a day.

But it thus appears that the rank and scope and quality of womanhood could permit a woman, by birth and marriage of Rome's highest blood, to be divorced, disgraced, without recourse, without trial; while her alleged paramour was exonerated and exalted by her husband, and while that husband was betraying his own friends and peers, and covering himself with such guilt as would close against a man the door of every American home.

For while Pompey was in Asia fighting his country's battles, the foremost man of all this world, the fine gentleman, the immaculate idealist of feminine purity, found the occasion auspicious to ingratiate himself in the affections of Mucia, Pompey's wife. The great warrior came home conqueror. He had penetrated, the first Roman general, to the holy city, Jerusalem. The clash of his armor had resounded in the holy temple. His pagan feet, curious but unwitting, had desecrated the holy of holies. He returned, victorious, to a greater desecration. He came back to receive the adoring plaudits of his countrymen, and found—a darkened hearth, a wife disgraced, children worse than orphaned by his personal friend, his social peer, his fellow-officer, his family connection. So notorious was the scandal that his indignant and immediate divorce of Mucia, although she was the mother of his three children, met with general approbation.

Yet Mucia was no low-born woman raised by her beauty to the rank of Pompey. Her brothers were bishops, mayors, judges, magistrates, in close official and personal association with the man who betrayed her. One of them was an intimate friend of the most attractive man of antiquity, the most perfect antitype of the modern man, the peace-loving, literature-loving, family-loving Cicero. But Mucia's mother, alas! was of such repute that her name could not escape the raillery of the wits of Rome or hold any shield before her daughter's disgrace.

Mucia could not be less blamed, but Pompey might be more pitied, if we could forget his own behavior to women. He had reason to repudiate Mucia, but his previous divorce of Antistia was not only causeless, but cruel. She was the daughter of a judge, of a man who had been so impressed with Pompey's forensic ability that he sought Pompey's alliance by marriage with his daughter, we may suppose with the daughter's assent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No fault seems to have been found with Antistia; but when Sylla, a still higher officer, fell in love with Pompey's military prowess, as Antistius had done with his forensic brilliancy, he also told his love in the same manner—by desiring a family alliance. Christianity would find this doubly difficult to accomplish, for not only was Pompey already married to Antistia, who was freshly mourning the death of her father, slain in the Senate because he was suspected of too great partiality for Pompey, but Sylla's only available kinswoman—if she could be called available, or a kinswoman—was his stepdaughter, Æmilia, who was married to another man, of whose child she was soon to become the mother. But none of these considerations had weight with Sylla, or apparently with Pompey. Antistia was divorced, and her mother, crazed by double sorrow,—the murder of her husband and the repudiation of her daughter,—took her own life. Æmilia was divorced and married to Pompey, and, as we must infer, crushed by grief and horror, died in giving birth to her first husband's child in her second husband's house.

The treachery of Mucia did but avenge Antistia. Yet one of the strong points of Pompey's character was his conjugal fidelity, his domestic felicity. He seems to have been as irresistible to women as he was to men. The devotion of his five young wives to their elderly husband was marked by his contemporaries and is signalized by history, while his devotion to them sometimes caused unfavorable comment, even from his admiring countrymen.

Nor do we hear that Cæsar suffered greatly in popular estimation. Society had a clear intellectual apprehension of duty, without any decided moral repulsion from vice and crime. Certainly Cæsar was not hindered in the career of his ambition. On the contrary, he seems deliberately to have planned to climb by his vices; to avail himself of the women he corrupted to conciliate the men he wronged. It was merely a mistake of calculation in the case of Pompey, who had grown too great to take kindly to the spoliation of his home. Returning with all the trophies and all the triumphs of a conqueror, he had nothing to ask of Cæsar. Cæsar, therefore, found it expedient to take the initiative and seek a reconciliation; and his one recourse was again the sacrifice of a woman. This time it was his own daughter and only child, sole offspring of his early-lost Cornelia. She was already betrothed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to Servilius Cæpio, and they were on the point of being married. None the less did Cæsar offer and Pompey accept her ravaged hand. To pacify Cæpio, Pompey's daughter was given him in exchange for Cæsar's daughter, and no one was deterred by the fact that Pompey's daughter was engaged to Faustus, the son of Sylla. Cæsar may have thought it only fair reprisals to snatch a wife from the son whose father had so desperately sought to snatch Cornelia from him.

So Faustus lost both wife and estate; and hardly had Cæsar steeped himself in the infamy of offering his daughter's broken faith to heal the wounds of his own, while Pompey had steeped himself in the equal infamy of accepting the offer, when we find Cæsar negotiating his own marriage with the daughter of Calpurnius Piso, one of Pompey's stanch adherents and lieutenants, thus through Piso, as well as Pompey, aggrandizing his own influence to the point of supremacy. There was no public opinion to protect the women or condemn the men.

Cato did, indeed, protest, and called gods and men to witness how insupportable it was that the first dignities of the state should be prostrated by marriages, and the complexion of the government determined by traffic in women! But, though Cato called a spade a spade, doubtless the Romans saw even more clearly than we that personal resentment may have lent terseness to his nomenclature. All patriot as he was, so that down even to our own time his name has reached as a synonyme for the noblest civic character, his family had not escaped the polluting touch of Julius Cæsar. The name of his sister Servilia was so unhandsomely associated with that of Cæsar that her son Brutus, "the noblest Roman of them all," was popularly reputed to be Cæsar's son. During Cæsar's first presidency of the Republic he gave her a pearl valued at nearly a quarter of a million of dollars—a pearl which is as much the public property of history as are the Gracchi jewels of an earlier time. Brazen and shameless, Julius Cæsar sat side by side with Cato in the Senate, and published his fiendish triumph over the shamed but helpless brother. In a heated debate touching the punishment of the Cataline conspirators, Cato, seeing a note brought in to Cæsar, incautiously charged him with some traitorous communication, and it was immediately moved that the billet be read in the Senate—moved, perhaps, at Cæsar's sly suggestion, that Cato might be caught in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the trap. Cato was caught in the trap. Cæsar handed him the note. Cato at the first glance recognized the handwriting of his sister, and flung it back to Cæsar with the indignant exclamation, "Take it, you sot!"

Through all the centuries one can see the sneering smile on the lip of Cæsar, the accomplished, self-possessed man of the world, at this humiliating advantage over the rough and discomfited man of simple honor. Is it any wonder that, when Cæsar had trampled under foot all his opponents, Cato chose to die in the old Roman way, by self-slaughter, rather than come under the dominion of this man, who had made public mockery of his sister's shame and his own anguish? It is reckoned magnanimity in Cæsar that, upon hearing of Cato's death, he exclaimed: "I envy him, because he has envied me the glory of pardoning him." But Cæsar's pardon would have been harder for Cato to bear than was Cato's sword.

How much even the designs of Cato's nephew, Brutus, against Julius Cæsar owed to the bitter shame that gnawed him for his mother's shame, we can never know. Cæsar certainly looked upon Brutus with an affection and treated him with a partiality which his contemporaries might well attribute to paternal ties, although posterity has taken the liberty of changing the "Καὶ σύ τέκνον" (you too, my son!) of Cæsar's dying lips into the more familiar "Et tu, Brute!" But Brutus's pride and love were in his descent from the ancient Brutuses, and I think the stab he gave to Cæsar at the foot of Pompey's statue must have borrowed its vim and its venom quite as much from family honor wounded as from national liberty threatened.

Yet when we look into Cato's "interior," we find a fearful and wonderful exhibition of the attitude of the highest pagan women. His wife, Attilia, the mother of his two children, he divorced for conjugal unfaithfulness, and married Marcia. Among Cato's friends and admirers was an eloquent lawyer and eminent gentleman, Hortensius, friend and rival of Cicero, whose tempestuous enthusiasm bore him to the point of proposing that Cato should give him in marriage his daughter Portia. As Portia was already a wife and the mother of two children, Cato, more scrupulous than Sylla, replied that, with the greatest esteem for Hortensius, he could not think of such a thing as giving him another man's wife. Hortensius met this objection cleverly by asking Cato to give

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him, then, his own wife! Cato, taken aback, replied that he must first consult—Marcia's father. Marcia's father, a gentleman of the highest political rank, saw no objection, and Marcia, although in the same pathetic condition as the unhappy Æmilia on a similar occasion, was married, with Cato's consent, in Cato's presence, to Hortensius. But Marcia was made of sterner stuff than Æmilia. She outlived Hortensius, remained on friendly and even helpful terms with Cato, and when Hortensius, dying, left her all his property, and Cato, going out to war, needed a chaperon for his daughters, the complaisant ex-husband remarried the complaisant rich widow, his ex-wife, and departed with the true Cato air of having discharged the whole duty of man. Is it to be wondered at that Cato's spade did not make much impression on the sewage-soaked soil of Roman society?

And when, in the next reign, the son, or perhaps it was the grandson, of Hortensius asked from Augustus some office or emolument to save him from poverty, did it occur to any one that the poor lad might have been robbed of his rightful wealth when Hortensius alienated his vast estates from his natural heirs to bestow them upon Cato's wife? Cato could speak great swelling words in eulogy of poverty; but he should have writhed in his grave beneath Cæsar's taunt of having sold his wife for Hortensius's gold.

Cicero also flashed his lightnings indirectly against these political marriage juggleries; but even my Cicero, the wise, witty, fond, foolish, pure, and pious; patriot, orator, author; the modern man—can he stand the ordeal of Christian scrutiny? Loved more than all, he is to be blamed more than all, because to him were given a finer touch and a warmer heart. Cicero liked gossip as only a man can, but he loved wife and child, and clave unto them like an American citizen. Terentia, when he wrote to her in his absences, was "Light of my eyes, my longed-for darling! from whom all used to seek help." Tullia, his daughter, was "Tulliola"—little Tullia; and, writing to his friends, he gave them the baby messages of his little Cicero, just as I would send the prattle of little Charlotte to her grandmamma, confident that nothing else in the wide world would be half as interesting. "Little Cicero sends greeting." "Young Cicero, the philosopher, sends greeting to Titus, the statesman." "Tully to Terentia, and the father to Tulliola, his two souls; and little Cicero to the best of mothers and his darling sister."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In exile and cruel sorrow he writes: "If these evils admit of no change, still I wish to see you, my life, as soon as possible, and die in your embrace." "Can I then exist without you? Be assured of this: if I have you, I shall not think myself wholly ruined." "Farewell, my Terentia, my most faithful and best of wives! and my dearest daughter, and Cicero, our only remaining hope."

What is, perhaps, even more trustworthy, he writes to his intimate friend, Atticus: "The only repose I enjoy is in the society of my wife and daughter and my honey-sweet Cicero."

The next we know he has divorced her! After living with her more than thirty years, being himself more than sixty years old, he turned and rent her, the mother of the two dear children, from his heart and from his house. And he gives no adequate reasons. He may have had them, but he has not produced them. Those which he does give are of the flimsiest. "I would not," he says, "have resolved on a divorce if I had not, on my return from abroad, found my domestic affairs in as bad a plight as the Republic itself."

The owner of ten villas, yet always in debt, always borrowing money for himself or for his brother Quintus, buying books, building fountains, fish-ponds, gymnasiums, entertaining great visitors, it is idle for Cicero to complain of poor Terentia because in his absence she had not managed things with entire economy. Terentia herself steadily maintained that Cicero had no real grounds for his action. She was a faithful and efficient wife—very unlike her sister-in-law, Pomponia, whom Quintus did not divorce without cause. Pomponia was sister of Cicero's life-long dearest friend, Atticus, but she had a temper of her own. When Cicero, as governor-general, was on his way to Cilicia, his brother naturally came up to meet him and escort him to his own house, on the route. As naturally, he telegraphed home to order dinner, which offended Pomponia as encroaching on her sphere. Unreasonable woman! If he had not warned her, but had come upon her unexpectedly with a whole house-party, she might well have been offended. When they reached her house, Quintus, in the most affable manner, begged her to invite the ladies among their neighbors, and he would invite the gentlemen.

"Oh, no," flouted my lady, "I am only a stranger here!" and refused to invite or even to join the company at table, or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

touch a tidbit which her hapless husband sent her by way of peace-offering. It is not heathenism alone which would be tempted to try the heroic remedy for such humors. "You see," moaned poor Quintus to his brother, "what I have daily to endure." Marcus sympathized with Quintus, but he carried his sympathy to the doubtful point of complaining to Pomponia's brother, his friend Atticus. Pomponia, like many a fine lady of modern times under similar grievances, had "gone home to her mother," and Cicero begged Atticus to tell her that this time, at least, Quintus was not to blame. Nor can we justify him for peeping into a letter, which came through his mail, from Pilia, the young wife of Atticus, to the offending Quintus. True, he was certain it was about this conjugal quarrel—as it was—and he was intensely curious to see what view Pilia took of it. He was also confident that Atticus would not, any more than himself, think a woman's privacy had any rights which he was bound to respect; but he had a sufficient fear of woman's wrath, whatever may have been his respect for her rights, to warn Atticus not to let Pilia know that he had been tampering with her letters! Dear old gossip! "You know," he prattled to Atticus, "we both are pretty curious," and spun another yarn of Roman tittle-tattle.

Is there any pen at this moment recording for the amusement of the fortieth century—what is unknown to the nineteenth—that our Ciceronian Evartses and Shermans and Reeds and Depews are Ciceronian gossips too?

But Terentia was no Pomponia. When Cicero sent word to his villa at Tusculum to make ready bath and banquet for a party from Brundusium, history records no balking on Terentia's part. She and Pomponia did not get on very well together,—as who did get on smoothly with pampered Pomponia?—but when Cicero invites Atticus to Rome on a festive day, Terentia lets by-gones be by-gones, and hospitably adds her invitation to his sister Pomponia and to their mother. Just the same, however, Cicero divorced Terentia, who took upon herself the remarkable revenge of living to be one hundred and four years old and marrying three husbands after she had been discarded by Cicero.

Perhaps, after all, then, Cicero had his reasons, though he preserved the dignity of not giving them.

Alas! but he married again—this time a young girl of whom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he had been made guardian and who had something of a fortune. It has an ugly sound, but it could not have been quite so bad as it sounds, because, very soon, alas! he divorced her also, and when a Roman divorced his wife without "cause," the law obliged him to refund her dowry. Poor Cicero seems to have been struggling all the rest of his life to pay back the dowries of his divorced wives; and in the discipline let us trust he made expiation.

What was his aversion to his second wife, his girlish Publilia, we do not know, but we know that it was acute and insurmountable. Her family were very anxious that he should take her again, but he would not listen to it. She wrote to him that her mother and her brother were coming to Astura to see him, and prayed that he would let her accompany them. He not only peremptorily forbade them all, but wrote in a panic to Atticus to be on the watch and give him timely notice if they left Rome, that he might take himself out of the way! And the only shadow of reason given by his friends for the divorce is that Cicero was disgusted with her because she did not grieve enough at the death of Tullia.

Poor Tullia, sweet Tulliola, too, must take her place in the witness box and testify to the degrading and degraded position of pagan women. A devoted daughter and her father's darling from her cradle to her grave, her early death broke his heart; but her blighted life is the sad record of pagan womanhood.

Her first marriage was sufficiently happy, but her husband died young, and a year afterwards her father married her to Crassipes, a man high in office, but who shortly afterwards divorced her. Yet Cicero remained on friendly and even confidential terms with him, and, nothing daunted, turned his thought to procuring her a third husband.

Many suitors sought her hand, but Cicero's choice fell on the worst of all, Dolabella, a cruel profligate, who at the time was married to Fabia, but *was contemplating divorce*. Cicero knew his character, and on occasion did not hesitate to mention it. But Dolabella was of an old family and proud position, and Cicero was a "new man" under the glamour of "hereditary aristocracy," and he gave to Dolabella's keeping that dearest treasure, his daughter. He may not have forced Tullia, but he did not warn her. She married Dolabella, but she could not long endure life with him, and another divorce came. Dolabella, however, was a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spendthrift, and Tullia's dowry had been scattered to the four winds as fast as it was paid over. Cicero in vain sought the debt due from the conscienceless Dolabella, and was obliged to sell his plate and furniture. Yet they, too, remained on good and even affectionate terms. Dolabella addressed his father-in-law as "my dearest Cicero," and Cicero gave lessons in declamation to Dolabella, and wrote to him in warmest praise for having quelled a riot—though he remarked in a letter to Atticus that it would be a much greater deed if Dolabella would pay the money he owed him. Oh! my honey-sweet Cicero!

But Tullia came home broken-hearted to her father, with the little son born under her husband's roof after her divorce. A few weeks she lingered, and then Cicero's house was left unto him desolate.

I have spoken only of women in the first society, in official society, the lawful wives of eminent men. They constituted the highest circles of Rome and therefore of the world. They represent the Roman Republic. They are to be compared with the leading woman of present republics; with Mrs. Harrison and Madame Carnot; with the women of Cabinet and Congress and drawing-room. Looking from these great Roman ladies of all parties to the great ladies of our own Republic, irrespective of party, whose spotlessness one would no more think of noting than of the sun its shining, who sway men by inspiration, and are controlled by love and conscience, but are commanded by men never at all, we cannot fail to see that, if early Christianity pulled women down, *something* in the following centuries has made up for it.

GAIL HAMILTON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PASTEUR TREATMENT.

BY DR. PAUL GIBIER, DIRECTOR OF THE NEW YORK PASTEUR INSTITUTE.

WITHIN a few years, thanks to Pasteur's important labors, the question of rabies has been so thoroughly agitated that it is somewhat difficult to discuss the subject, especially in a periodical like this REVIEW, without exposing one's self to utter commonplace, instead of presenting to the reader facts altogether unknown to him. However, owing to the general attention that has been attracted to the subject by the method of preventive inoculations, some data upon experimental rabies have, important though they are, remained in the background, and I will endeavor to explain them briefly before entering upon the study of the method I have just spoken of.

In the first stage of the history of that mysterious disease, rabies, we run against a mystery: why is not the period of incubation the same in all individuals? Some die fifteen or twenty days after having been bitten, whereas others meet their fate only after a few months or even a few years. One case in which the incubation lasted two years has been reported.* In the midst of the long and numerous experiments which the writer of these lines has performed upon rabies, there have occured, in cases in which the inoculation was performed upon the skin by means of incisions made with the lancet, some observations on rabbits in which the incubation varied from eighteen days to nine months.

As to the microbe which must, as in every contagious malady, be present in the substance whose constant virulency is admitted, —that is to say, the nervous substance,—its official existence has not as yet been recognized, although since 1883 I have at length

* Féréol (Union Médicale, 1874) cites a case in which the incubation lasted two years and a half; Colin (d'Alfort) another case in which two men, bitten by the same dog, died respectively forty days and *five years* after. (Ann. d'Hygiène Publique, 1881.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

described and drawn it, showing at the same time the proper means for placing it in evidence. The principal peculiarity of this germ is that we have as yet been unable to stain it, as may be done with other microbes. Neither can it be cultivated in an inert medium.

Finally, in order not to prolong unduly this part of our study, let me say that the manner in which this terrible disease behaves as to its termination, and according to the kinds of animals affected, is also a matter for wonder. In fact, though we may assume that many bitten individuals have a latent rabies which passes away unperceived and is cured,—preventive inoculations serve well to prove the possibility of this,—I know of no authentic case of manifest rabies that has been cured in man.* On the other hand, instances are not absolutely rare in which dogs have returned to the normal state after having shown unequivocal signs of rabies, and even after having communicated it to other animals. Further, I have experimentally demonstrated that birds, and notably hens, which contract rabies, may communicate it to mammifera, to which it will prove fatal, though the hens will spontaneously recover. In cases among birds attacked with rabies in which death appears to be imminent, owing to a very powerful infection, and when the paralysis is strongly marked, it is yet possible, as I have demonstrated, to prevent the fatal issue by feeding the bird by means of a tube which is inserted in the upper alimentary passages. My researches have, moreover, furnished the first experimental proof that rabies did not occur a second time, as I showed that the birds which had once been cured were unable to contract the malady a second time, even after a year, if inoculations were again performed on them.†

We have already seen that the incubation varies considerably as to duration; I must state as briefly as possible how the data of observation joined to those resulting from experiments are able to provide an explanation for this apparently-contradictory fact. After the rabic virus has been deposited upon the tissues that have been lacerated by a bite, one of two things may take place: either the virus remains on the wound, or it is car-

* However, I may say that among fifty observations of hydrophobia reported in *The Lancet* of March, 1890, by Dr. Lucas Benham, a certain number seem to have been genuine cases of hydrophobia.

† Académie des Sciences, C. R., Paris, 1883-'84-'85.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ried into the general circulation by some torn blood-vessel (commonly a vein). In the first case it may happen that the phagocytes (Metchnikoff) destroy the microbes, and no rabies occurs; but more frequently the germs, coming into contact with torn nerves, are developed within the central portion (myelaxis) of these organs, and thence are propagated as far as the nervous centres. This way had been theoretically indicated by several authors,* but lately it has been demonstrated by exceedingly ingenious experiments.† This may well explain the long duration of some incubations, for the march of the virus—that is to say, the development of microbes—may take place at first, and there only, in a minute nervous fibre whose cells offer a more or less important resistance to the invading germs, and before being able to reach the medulla and cerebral centres the journey's length must vary according to the distance from the inoculated spot to the medulla or the brain. This offers an explanation of the shortness of incubation observed in wounds of the head and face, as well as its longer duration when the limbs, and especially the lower ones, have been bitten.

If the absorption takes place through a blood-vessel or a lymphatic, it is easily understood that the incubation will not be of a much greater duration than in those cases in which, for experimental purposes, the rabic virus is injected in the veins of an animal. In this event the duration is independent of the situation of the wound. This mode of infection doubtless occurs chiefly in those lacerations which bleed abundantly.

However this may be, the incubation seldom lasts less than three weeks; it generally lasts much longer. It was the knowledge of this fact that suggested to Pasteur the idea, which has since proved so useful, that if one could render an animal refractory to rabies by means of injections of attenuated virus, it might doubtless be possible to produce this very state during the interval which separates the time of biting from that of invasion. This having been demonstrated in animals, it only remained to display sufficient audacity to make its practical application upon man.

I believe that the best means of giving an idea of the value of

* Duboué (de Pau) Physiologie, etc., de la Rage. Brown-Séquard in Holmes's 'System of Surgery," London, 1870.

† Di Vestea and Zagari, Giom. internaz. di Scienze Med. IX., Naples, 1887; *Idem*, Nouvelles expériences, Annales de l'Institut Pasteur, 1889; Roux Ann. Inst. Pasteur, t. II. No. 1., t. III. No. 2.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the preventive method devised by the eminent scientist is to state as briefly as facts will allow the results which have been obtained in the last few years by means of the inoculations that have been performed on a good many thousand people.

At the time of the opening of the Pasteur Institute in Paris, more than a year ago, the statistical situation was as follows: The inoculations had only been generally performed since the beginning of 1886. From that time until July, 1888 (thirty-six months), the number of persons inoculated at the Pasteur Institute at Paris was 5,374; an average of about five people daily. The official total of the mortality during this period, including all deaths, even of those who contracted rabies before the treatment was completed, was 1.34 per cent. for 1886. For 1887 it was 1.12 per cent., and in 1888, 0.77 per cent. But admitting that if, when death occurs within the fortnight which follows the treatment, it was because the nervous centres were already invaded by the virulent morbid germs when the treatment began (and this fact necessarily rendered it inefficacious), we obtain a diminution which lowers the total mortality, notwithstanding treatment, to 0.93 per cent. for 1886, to 0.67 per cent. for 1887, and to 0.55 per cent. for 1888. The decrease which is observed in the succession of years must be attributed to the gradual perfecting of the method. A method known as "intensive," by which a less attenuated virus is injected, or, rather, a larger quantity of the virulent liquid, than was done at first, has been substituted for the primitive method, and this practice, which is based upon experimental investigation, seems, by its successive developments, likely to bring about a mortality of 0 per cent. when the treatment begins in proper time.

Here are a few compilations from the statistics derived from various institutes founded on the principle of the Pasteur Institute in Paris.

In St. Petersburg, where, thanks to the generosity of Prince Alexandre of Oldenburg, an anti-rabic laboratory has been founded, 484 people were vaccinated during two years and two months (July, 1886, to September, 1888). The severity of the bites, which had in many cases been inflicted by rabid wolves, caused a rise in the mortality, which amounted to 2.68 per cent. This number, however, is far from the average of 80 per cent. of deaths which occur when the bitten persons are not treated.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Odessa, 324 persons were vaccinated in 1886 by the primitive method (simple treatment). The mortality was 3.39 per cent. But in 1887 and 1888, 709 persons submitted to the intensive treatment, and the mortality was lowered to 0.60 per cent.

In Moscow the institute was founded by Prince Dolgoroukow. One hundred and seven persons were vaccinated in 1886 with the simple treatment. The mortality was of 8.40 per cent. But in 1887 and 1888, the intensive treatment having been substituted, the mortality among 526 fell to 1.45 per cent.

In Warsaw, out of 370 people treated by the new method, not a single death occurred.

In Milan, 335 were inoculated; deaths, 0.60 per cent.

In Palermo, 109 inoculated; no deaths.

In Naples the anti-rabic laboratory had been closed for lack of subsidies; but nine deaths from hydrophobia having occurred in the town, the government and the city did what was needed to place the institute in working order; 246 persons were inoculated in a short time; mortality, 1.5 per cent.

In Havana, where my friend Dr. Santos Fernandez, assisted by Dr. Tamayo and a pleiad of brilliant workers, has established an anti-rabic laboratory, out of 170 people who were bitten and inoculated, the mortality was only 0.60 per cent.

Finally, in Rio Janeiro, where Dom Pedro II. encouraged the establishment of a splendid institute, fifty-three persons have been inoculated within a short time, without a single death.

It would be needless to resume for 1889 the series of statistics which have been considered for the years 1886-'87-'88, and which are now of a value acquired by the time that has elapsed. If we consider that the perfected methods are applied by hands which are becoming better and better trained, it will not be surprising if these satisfactory results continue and become even more favorable. In a recent communication M. Pasteur has been able to say, with a legitimate sense of satisfaction, that among the last thousand inoculations that have been performed in his institute, there had not occurred a single unsuccessful case. This, in numbers, may be put down as follows: mortality, 0 per cent.

Scientific England has been one of the first countries to accept the new doctrine of germs in the production of diseases, and every memory recalls the thankful letter sent by Sir J.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lister to Pasteur after the marvellous results obtained by the antiseptic method which the English surgeon, inspired by the labors of the great French biologist, had inaugurated in his Edinburgh clinic. The same is true of the prophylaxis of rabies: I only wish to recall the report of Mr. V. Horsley, the eminent physiologist, who, in the name of an official commission composed of the principal scientists of England (among them Sir J. Paget), recently declared that "Mr. Pasteur had discovered a method preventive of rabies that was comparable to vaccination against variola." England has been one of the chief subscribers to the Pasteur Institute of Paris, where a number of British subjects are daily cared for.

I will devote but a few words to the technique of the successive operations required for the preparation of the anti-rabic vaccine.

The vaccinal matter consists of fragments of the spinal cord of a rabbit killed by hydrophobia, which are progressively desiccated at a fixed temperature and in the dark. Every day a fragment of the substance thus prepared is injected, but every time a less dried specimen is employed: this is equivalent to saying that every day the injection is made with matter that is coming nearer and nearer to the normal virulent state, to which the body is thus gradually accustomed. There is scarcely any need of adding that a thorough knowledge of bacteriological technique is indispensable in all the operations through which pass the inoculating materials: otherwise the most fearful accidents might suddenly supervene.

But how is brought about this condition which causes the body to become resistant to a living poison which in ordinary circumstances would cause its death? To remain within the bounds of the question that now occupies us, here are the differences between the two chief theories: according to one, the microbe secretes a vacciniferous substance; the nervous system gradually becomes accustomed to the effect of this secretion, and becomes able to resist the microbe, producer of this substance, when the latter is brought in contact with it. Towards this theory Pasteur seemed to lean at the start. But experimentation, let us say at once, would seem to give support to the other theory, which may be formulated as follows: the nervous system is able to resist the virulent microbe only when it has been brought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

into contact at first with a small number of these same microbes in an attenuated, weakened state. The success of the method known as the "intensive" one, besides the experiments made upon animals, which our limited space does not allow us to describe here, would seem to favor the latter mode of explaining the production of immunity against rabies.

Let me say, before closing, that with the aid of the subscriptions which have been made towards the work of M. Pasteur, an institute for the purpose of studying general and special bacteriology has been erected in Paris. As regards size and convenience, this institute is unique, and from all parts of the world physicians, naturalists, and scientists generally come to be initiated in the methods which the master first devised, and which his disciples have perfected in various ways. I hope no one will see in my description any idea of "nationalistic" pride. I am merely proud, as a man, to recognize to what a degree of perspicacity, of ingenuity, and of science the human genius can rise—that is all. I believe, nevertheless, that I have kept myself far below the praise and the marks of admiration that are deserved by the work of my illustrious countryman and master.

PAUL GIBIER, M.D.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FALSE HYDROPHOBIA.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D., SURGEON-GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY (RETIRED).

THERE are very few persons who are not more or less under the influence of "suggestion." They seem to be endowed with comparatively low powers of original action, and to be moved to an extent scarcely normal by the facts and circumstances that surround them. A woman, for instance, overwhelmed with misfortune and weary of life, commits suicide by swallowing paris green, and straightway we read in the daily press of other women, to whom the idea of suicide would never otherwise have been suggested, who have had no sufficient motive for the act, and who have had no previous knowledge of the poisonous effects of paris green, taking their lives in like manner.

The more unusual the method of self-destruction, the more probability there is that some persons will adopt it. Several years ago a man confined in the Tombs Prison, in the city of New York, killed himself by cutting his femoral artery—the main artery of the thigh. There was no previous case on record of such a mode of suicide, and yet within a few days several persons destroyed themselves by cutting the femoral artery.

We have all heard the story of the man who, thinking he was being bled to death while his eyes were bandaged and a stream of warm water was allowed to flow over his arm, actually died within the proper period, with all the symptoms that would have ensued had he really died from hemorrhage.

A professor of anatomy, while making a post-mortem examination of a man who had cut his throat and who had died after several days of great suffering, said to his servant, who was assisting him, "Hans, whenever you have a mind to cut your throat, don't do it in so blundering a way as did this fellow—here is the place to cut," pointing to the region of the carotid artery. Up to this time Hans had been a happy and well-disposed man, with apparently no thought of suicide. Yet that night he went home and cut his throat.

There seems to be, in fact, no limit to the power of the principle of suggestion with some persons. Pains are readily excited

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in various parts of the body, and others as rapidly removed, through its agency. Objects can be made to assume any form that the suggestor pleases. Thus a lady who is a wonderfully sensitive subject to this influence came under my professional charge for some slight derangement of her nervous system. If I told her that a book was a watch, it became, so far as she was concerned, an actual watch. If I put a piece of ice in her hand and told her it was boiling water, she shrieked with pain and declared that I scalded her. If, while the sun was shining, I told her that the rain was coming down in torrents, she at once began to lament her sad plight in being so far from home without an umbrella, and would beg me to call a carriage for her. Every one of her senses could be imposed upon in like manner; and I have frequently controlled the action of her heart, making its pulsations slower or more rapid in accordance with the spoken suggestion. There is no doubt that, if I had put a little flour in her mouth, at the same time telling her that it was strychnia and describing the symptoms of death by strychnia, she would have died with all the phenomena of poisoning with that powerful substance; or that, if I had pointed an unloaded pistol at her head, and had cried "Bang!" she would fallen dead to the floor. All this sounds very much like hypnotism, but this lady was not in that state, unless there is a form of that condition—and perhaps there is—that cannot be distinguished from the ordinary normal life of the individual. Neither was she the subject of double consciousness, for she was perfectly aware of every circumstance that occurred, and there was not the slightest indication of a dual existence.

That such a disease as hydrophobia, with such strongly-marked characteristics, should, under the action of the principle of suggestion, be simulated by hysterical or other nervous persons, is not a matter for surprise. Every year, as the summer approaches, the newspapers contain accounts of cases of so-called hydrophobia which, to the practised judgment of the physician, seem to be entirely due to the imagination of the sufferer. It is clearly important that such a disorder should be prevented, for not only does great distress ensue, but even death itself has not unfrequently been the consequence. As several instances of the kind have come under my personal observation, I may perhaps be allowed to speak with some authority on the subject.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It may be laid down in the very beginning of our consideration of the subject that the victim of false hydrophobia can only have those symptoms of which he has knowledge. Unfortunately, the real disease has received so much notice from newspapers and other popular publications that a tolerably correct knowledge of its phenomena has been acquired by the laity. Hence, we find that the picture ordinarily presented by the unconscious simulator is, at least to cursory observation, not unlike the real affection. There are, however, great differences, which the educated physician will not fail to detect, and which will enable him to do what has never been yet done with real hydrophobia—cure the patient.

Hydrophobia never originates, in the human subject at least, except by inoculation from a rabid animal, and death always occurs in four or five days after the development of the disease. A case of so-called hydrophobia came under my notice in which it was stated that the patient had been bitten some three months previously by a dog undoubtedly hydrophobic. I inquired as to what had become of the dog, and was informed that he was still living, having recovered. It was not necessary to examine any further into the particulars of this case, for if the dog had really been the subject of hydrophobia, he would have been dead very shortly after biting my patient.

Again, it often happens that a person easily affected by suggestion has what he conceives to be the symptoms of hydrophobia developed very soon after having been bitten by a supposed rabid animal, whereas the real disease rarely supervenes until after a month has elapsed from the time of inoculation. It is true, there are cases on record in which the period of incubation was less than that, but they are exceedingly rare. In my own cases the time has varied from twenty-five days to four months and a half. Cases in which the disease is said to have supervened many years after an alleged inoculation ought to be received with doubt. The interval probably never exceeds two years or is less than ten days.

There are a want of consistency and a degree of exaggeration about the symptoms of false hydrophobia which of themselves are sufficient to excite suspicion as to the real character of the phenomena. Thus one of the most noticeable occurrences in hydrophobia is the spasm of the muscles concerned in respiration and swallowing; and this not only when the patient attempts to swallow, but it is also developed by any circumstance capable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of exciting the *idea* of swallowing. The subject of the false disease, not having a full knowledge of the matter imagines that the inability to swallow water is all that is sufficient, and hence, although the attempt to drink a glass of water will generally produce intense spasms, these do not always occur under similar circumstances, as, for instance, when coffee or whiskey or other liquid is presented to him. He knows the name "hydrophobia" means fear of water, and the exhibition of terror and convulsive movements about his throat when this liquid is placed before him, and especially when he is told to swallow it, fulfil, to his mind, all the requirements of the occasion, and he knows nothing whatever of those secondary and more refined influences, such as the sound of falling water, bright light in the face, excitations applied to the skin, seeing others drink, etc., which so generally cause the most intense distress and violent spasms in the real disease.

There are not the same anxiety and depression in the simulated disease as in the real, although the apparent emotional disturbance is much greater. The false-hydrophobic patient is loud in the expression of apprehensions, while the victim of actual hydrophobia, though intensely anxious and terrified, endeavors to prevent others from perceiving the state of his mind. To reason, or to argue with, or to command such a patient is a waste of words, for the disease from which he suffers is in no way under his control; but with the imaginary disorder the case is very different, and suggestions or orders given to him by one in whom he has confidence, or of whom he stands somewhat in awe, will very generally break up the whole course of the morbid phenomena.

Thus, several years ago, I saw, in consultation, a policeman who had, two or three days before, been bitten by a dog, and whose comrades had frightened him by their inquiries and suggestions. He was then in the Park Hospital in the city of New York, held down on a bed by four strong men and snapping like a dog at every one who came near him. At the sight of water he became intensely excited and went through a series of fearful contortions of his limbs. He had visions of mad dogs running after him trying to bite him, and was constantly hiding his face in terror under the bedclothes. Every attempt to make him drink a glass of water produced a series of spasms and howls of anguish that alarmed the neighborhood and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

threw all the women in the house into fits of hysterical laughing and sobbing. The short period of incubation, the extreme violence of his symptoms, and the fact that he had drunk a glass or two of brandy without any difficulty, gave me at once a clear idea of the case. I filled a tumbler with ice-cold water and, holding it to his lips, told him in a commanding tone to drink it immediately. He took the tumbler in his hand and swallowed the water as readily as he had ever done in his life. The spell was broken, and a few minutes afterwards he got out of bed, declaring that he was perfectly well, and he went to duty the next morning. It is quite within the limits of probability that, if this man had been allowed to go on for two or three days in the way he had begun, death from exhaustion would have been the consequence.

That death may result from false hydrophobia is as well established as any other fact in medical science. There is a case on record of a man who died in fifteen hours with all the symptoms of hydrophobia, which had ensued on a violent paroxysm of anger.

There is also the case of a woman who was bitten by a dog in the face, and who was admitted to the Hôtel-Dieu, in Paris. After a few days she was cured of her wounds and discharged.

There was no suspicion that the dog was hydrophobic. But, going about her usual vocations, she one day heard a man exclaim: "She has not gone mad then!" From that moment she could not swallow liquids, and the same day she was readmitted to the Hôtel-Dieu—this time to die with all the symptoms of hydrophobia.

And here is another instance. A woman had been bitten by a dog which was supposed not to be rabid, and the injury had healed. Two months after the accident she was met by two students, who had seen her at the hospital, and who in joke asked her if she was not yet mad. She was immediately seized with nervous symptoms, because intensely anxious and uneasy, and went into the hospital firmly convinced that she was affected with hydrophobia. She was at once placed under treatment, but the symptoms in which an irrepressible degree of fear was prominent were rapidly developed, and in forty-eight hours she was dead.

A recent occurrence in the way of false hydrophobia is very instructive. A dog supposed to be rabid bit three men, who, having faith in what is popularly known as the "mad-stone," had it applied to their wounds and imagined that all danger had been avoided. But one of them, in order to make assurance doubly sure, had him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self heavily ironed in order that, should hydrophobia supervene, he might not inflict any injury to his family. It is by no means established that the dog that bit him was affected with hydrophobia; but even if perfectly healthy, it is certain that the extraordinary precautions taken by this man to avoid what he imagined would be some of the symptoms of rabies would of themselves have been sufficient to develop the false disease. At any rate, in a few days many of the phenomena of hydrophobia, and a good many others due to the intense fear under which the patient labored, were developed, and shortly afterwards he died. The other two men who were bitten at the same time, are said to be in an agony of fear lest they also may die of hydrophobia. The medical journal, the *Times and Register*, from which I quote the account of this case, says:

"We can imagine James Beard chained hand and foot, seated helplessly in a chair and passing wearily the time, feeling as if every minute were an hour, every hour a day, and every day almost a lifetime; with nothing to do but brood over his misfortune and the awful consequenes likely to ensue. Any little sensation that at other times would pass unnoticed would now be magnified in his fancy a thousand-fold. A twinge of pain in the wound would be the dreadful poison at work; a change of color would be mortification; the slight jerk of a muscle would be the beginning of convulsions. Add to these the apparently trivial, but to him fateful, fears, the questions, looks, and behavior of friends, acquaintances, and visitors. All would look curiously and inquisitively at him; some would scoff and ridicule at his chains; others would shake their heads knowingly and whisper in the corner; some would anxiously inquire whether he thought himself just as well as he had been, whether he was sure he could swallow as easily; did the bite hurt him, or change color? Did he feel any particular nervous sensation? Others again would suggest that he looked careworn and haggard, but that he ought not to give way so; he was just to grit his teeth and determine not to have it, and they felt quite sure he would come through.

"Days spent in such fearful imaginings and amidst these Job's comforters would be almost enough to unseat the soundest mind, not to speak of one that was, at best, probably far from strong."

To bark like a dog, to snap at those near by, and even to run about on all fours, are among the most prominent symptoms of false hydrophobia; the patient being imbued with the idea that the hydrophobic virus which he imagines has been absorbed into his system is calculated to assimilate him to the animal by which he has been poisoned. Now, such symptoms are never witnessed in true hydrophobia, and their presence is amply sufficient for a discrimination between the two affections. A little knowledge is a dangerous thing; and this is especially true of the sciolism which prevails relative to hydrophobia.

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RECENT PROGRESS IN THEOSOPHY.

BY MADAME BLAVATSKY.

WHATEVER else may be thought of theosophy and its movement, time has at least proved that it is not the ephemeron which the American and foreign press called it upon its first appearance. It seems to have come to occupy a permanent place in modern thought, thus vindicating the truth of Sir John Herschel's observation that "the grand, and, indeed, the only, character of truth is its capability of enduring the test of universal experience, and coming unchanged out of every possible form of fair discussion."

Unfortunately, theosophy has never yet had a "fair" chance; but that must come. It has been represented in a most grotesque light, travestied out of all resemblance. With few exceptions, even its friends have shown in their published writings an imperfect grasp of the subject. If it had been discussed upon its merits, apart from the personalities with which the movement has been associated, we cannot doubt that it would have had by this time a much wider vogue than it has. All the signs point that way. The most strenuous efforts of bigots, theological and scientific, and the employment of ridicule, sarcasm, misrepresentations, and denunciations by its opponents, have failed to check the growth of the Theosophical Society or its influence, or even to impede the expansion of the theosophical idea throughout the world. Scarcely the most optimistic among the society's organizers dreamt of such success as has rewarded their labors. The little coterie of thoughtful men and women who met in an Irving-Place parlor one summer evening in the year 1875 builded better than they (with their undeveloped foresight) knew, when they resolved to organize such an association.

We are often asked, "What is the general object of the Theosophical Society? *Cui bono* all this outlay of labor, all that energy expended from its beginning to swim against the strong tide of public prejudice, sectarian hatred, and unpopularity? Of the three well-known objects of the society* not one but had, and

* 1. Brotherhood of man; 2. Study of Oriental philosophies; 3. Investigation of the hidden forces in nature and man. *Vide supra.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has, its teachers and followers in the past as in the present. Your first object, namely, brotherhood of man, lies at the very basis of Christianity; your second is promoted by the Asiatic societies, the national museums, and all the Orientalists; your third may be allowed to remain in the hands of the men of science, who have already dissected spiritualism and exploded mesmerism, and now, under the lead of the Society for Psychical Research, are disposing of the question of thought-transferrence, the phantasm of the living, and the Theosophical Society."

We note the exception that the *cuckoo* S. P. R. hatched its first eggs in the nests of theosophy and spiritualism;* it evidently has the same relation to the scientific body as to its two foster-mothers, and can enjoy a superior intimacy only as a reward for its treachery to the latter and its sycophancy to materialistic science. In rejoinder to the first two assertions, the Theosophists would ask Christians and Orientalists what they were doing in their respective departments to realize practically our first two objects? Under correction, I must say that it has been all talk and theory. Has the Sermon on the Mount, all its moral beauty notwithstanding, caused so-called Christian nations to treat each other in the ideal Christian spirit, or to offer brotherhood to Asiatic and African nations and tribes, whom they have subdued by force of arms or wiles? And has the philosophical acumen of Professor Max Müller, who has been showing us for thirty years past that the same Aryan blood runs in the brown body of the Indian sepoy as under the blanched skin of the English lord and British grocer, prevented the dominant Anglo-Indian from giving the Queen-Empress's Asiatic subjects cumulative proofs of his supreme disdain? The Theosophical Society has been called the Royal Asiatic Society *plus* philanthropy; and as the latter body lacks the instinct of brotherliness, and too often shows a disposition to sacrifice truth for theological predilection, its nearly a century of work has shed darkness instead of light upon the Aryan philosophies, religions, and sciences. As to our third object, it

* The real originator and founder of the S. P. R. was "M. A. Oxon" (Mr. W. Stainton Moses), now the editor of *Light*. It was he who, being then a member of the T. S., first proposed the formation of a society on the lines of the long-defunct *Dialectical Society* of London, for the investigation of abnormal phenomena. This gentleman must have regretted more than once his idea. The S. P. R., the progeny of spiritualism and theosophy, has proved itself a would-be parricide, though rather an unsuccessful one so far.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be said of the work of the S. P. R., and the superior labor of the French hypnotists of Paris and Nancy, that these agencies, while accumulating a mass of important facts for future philosophers, have, with a very few honorable exceptions, tried their best to give a false interpretation to those phenomena that they could not dispose of on the theory of fraud. Their oblations have been all offered on the altar of the Moloch of materialism.

Since it is undeniable that this materialistic bias has been rapidly culminating under university influence during the past half-century, it is too evident that the creation of the Theosophical Society at the time when it arose was most timely, and a step toward the defence of *true* science and *true* religion against a sciolism that was becoming more and more arrogant. The experiments of Charcot at the *Salpêtrière* have been so unsatisfactorily explained by the professors of his materialistic school that the appearance of the ancient esoteric philosophy in the arena of Western thought was a vital necessity. The conviction has already dawned upon the minds of some of the eleverest Western experimentalists that the "impassable chasm" and the "unknowable" of Messrs. Tyndall and Spencer can never be bridged or known by anything short of the Aryan esoteric doctrine. The cultured interest and popular curiosity that are shown in every country when a Theosophist or theosophy comes to the fore, and the universal popularity of theosophical and mystical literature, which has enriched many publishers and writers, are indications of the despair and hope of Christendom—despair that science will ever read the puzzle of life; hope that the solution may be found in the secret doctrine.

The theosophical movement was a necessity of the age, and it has spread under its own inherent impulsion, and owes nothing to adventitious methods. From the first it has had neither money, endowment, nor social or governmental patronage to count upon. It appealed to certain human instincts and aspirations, and held up a certain lofty ideal of perfectibility, with which the vested extraneous interests of society conflicted, and against which these were foredoomed to battle. Its strongest allies were the human yearnings for light upon the problem of life, and for a nobler conception of the origin, destiny, and potentialities of the human being. While materialism and its congener, secularism, were bent upon destroying not only theology and sectarian dog-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

matism, but even the religious conception of a diviner Self, theosophy has aimed at uniting all broad religious people for research into the actual basis of religion and scientific proofs of the existence and permanence of the higher Self. Accepting thankfully the results of scientific study and exposure of theological error, and adopting the methods and maxims of science, its advocates try to save from the wreck of cults the precious admixture of truth to be found in each. Discarding the theory of miracle and supernaturalism, they endeavor to trace out the kinship of the whole family of world-faiths to each other, and their common reconciliation with science. The growing inclination of the public mind toward theosophy seems to mark a reaction from the iconoclastic influence of Colonel Ingersoll's and Mr. Bradlaugh's school. Undoubtedly there are thousands of so-called Free-thinkers who sincerely believe in personal annihilation at the death of the body; but it would seem from the fact of the recent conversion of Mrs. Annie Besant from secularism to theosophy, and the discussions to which it has given rise, that there are also many persons enrolled as followers of the two great leaders above mentioned who are so from ignorance of the views included in the term theosophy. We officers and fellows of the Theosophical Society are, therefore, encouraged to hope that, with the wider dissemination of the facts, we shall see very large accessions to our cause from the secularist ranks. Surely this must be considered a gain by the friends of spirituality as opposed to materialism,—those, at any rate, who think that morals, peace, and prosperity will be promoted by the universal belief in a life after death (whether eternal or broken up by a series of reincarnations on the same earth), and in man's possession of a higher, undying SELF, latent spiritual powers, and consciousness.

It is the worse for the public, particularly for the religious feelings of the public, that the organs of sectarian bigotry should have succeeded so well by perversion of fact, frenzied calumny, and downright falsehood, in making our cause and the society appear in such a false light during the past fourteen years. Nor are the clerical organs alone in this undignified and useless work; for the weeklies of the Spiritualists in the United States are just as bitter and as untruthful in their ceaseless denunciation of theosophy. The virulence and vituperations of the intellectual apostles of the "spirit-guides" and "controls" from the "Summer-land" have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown proportionately to the growth of the Theosophical Society. The effects of the last convention held by the American Theosophists at Chicago, on April 29 and 30 of the present year,* furnish a brilliant example of this blind and ferocious hatred. Such was the decided and unprecedented success of the last gathering that even the leading papers of Chicago and other cities had to admit the fact, finding almost for the first time naught but words of sympathy for the Theosophists. Alone the organs of disembodied "angels" poured as unsuccessfully as ever their vials of wrath, mockery, and brutal slander upon us. But we heed them not. Why should we? The utmost malignity and basest treachery have not been able either to controvert our ideas, belittle our objects, disprove the reasonableness of our methods, or fasten upon us a selfish or dishonest motive. And as our declared principles are not merely unobjectionable, but admirably calculated to do good to mankind, these conspirators and calumniators have simply kept a multitude of religiously-inclined persons from enjoying the happiness they would have had by understanding theosophy as it really is, and making it the guiding rule of their conduct.

If justice be the law of nature, and injustice a transitory evil, direful must, indeed, be the retribution these misguided people have invoked upon their own heads. The suffering we have been made to endure has but served as discipline, and taught us to turn the more loyally toward the esoteric doctrine for comfort and encouragement.

My present theme being the recent progress of our movement, the situation may best be illustrated by reference to statistics. To avoid prolixity, we may begin with the year 1884, when the raid upon us was made by the London Society for Psychical Research. From the official report of that year it appears that on the 31st of December, 1884, there were in existence, in all parts of the world, 104 chartered branches of the Theosophical Society. In the year 1885, as an answer to our calumniators, seventeen new charters were issued; in 1886, fifteen; in 1887, twenty-two; in 1888, twenty-one; and up to the 1st of September, 1889, seventeen. To the 31st of December, 1888, six

* There are at the present day *thirty-eight* chartered branches of the Theosophical Society in the United States, and the activity on the Pacific Coast in this direction is very remarkable.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

charters had been rescinded, leaving 173 still valid; and if the new ones of 1889 be added, there would be a gross total of 190 chartered branches, from which would have to be deducted any cancellations reported during the last twelvemonth. But we have heard of none. On the contrary, up to June, 1890, we find on our books upward of 200 branches. In England, a country where theosophy has to work up-hill more than in any other place, three years ago there was but one solitary branch—the "London Lodge" of the Theosophical Society, with about 150 members in it. Since the arrival of the present writer in England, and the establishment of the "Blavatsky Lodge," in June, 1887 (which has now upward of 300 members and associates), twelve branches of the Theosophical Society have been established in various centres of Great Britain, and the number of members is daily increasing. The growth of our society in this conservative country has been more marvellous in comparison than even in the United States of America. The growth since the raid of 1884 has, therefore, been at the rate of about nineteen new charters per annum, and the final computation of 1889 will show as great an increment. Dividing 104—the sum total up to the close of 1884—by 10, the number of years since the society's foundation, we get an average annual growth of 10.4 branches; whence it appears that, so far from being crushed out of existence, as the organizers of the raid had fondly hoped might be the result, the Theosophical Society has very largely increased its average rate of expansion, geographically and numerically. It is useless to remind the American reader of the unrelenting, systematic persecution to which the writer of these lines—and through her, theosophy—is, and has been for years, subjected in the American press, by enemies as persevering as they are base. And if no conspiracy, no attack, could ever seriously shake the society or impede its movement, nothing ever will. We can only thankfully repeat, slightly paraphrasing it, the Christian adage now so applicable to our movement, "The blood of the martyrs is the seed of theosophy." Its society has done too much good work, the good grain is much too evident even in the piles of admitted chaff, not to have built a secure foundation for the temple of truth in the immediate, as in the distant, future.

For, see, the literature of theosophy is growing rapidly. We have seven principal centres of publication—Madras, Bombay,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ceylon (Colombo), Stockholm, London, Paris, and New York. The Stockholm branch, founded hardly a year ago, has far over one hundred members, and our literature in Sweden is spreading rapidly. Little Ceylon had twenty-one branches three months ago, and may have more now. Madras is the general headquarters of the society, the official residence of the president and executive staff, and the office of *The Theosophist* is there. At Bombay we have a "Theosophical Publication Fund," created and managed by Mr. Tookaram Tatya, a Hindoo Theosophist, which brings out important works in Sanskrit and English; an enterprise spoken of with great praise by Professsor Max Müller in a letter published both in *The Theosophist* and *Lucifer*. In London there is a "Theosophical Publishing Society," which brings out the magazine *Lucifer* (edited by Mrs. Annie Besant and myself) and a series of pamphlets called the "T. P. S.," issued fortnightly, and many new theosophical works. Following the good example set to us by the Aryan Theosophical Society of New York,—the headquarters of the theosophical movement in America,—a committee was formed in London last May for the wide distribution through the post of leaflets on theosophical doctrines, each member taking charge of a definite district. During the first months of the establishment of the "tract-mailing scheme" at New York, the Aryan Thesophical Society has distributed over 150,000 papers on theosophy and its doctrines. In Paris another monthly was started a year ago, the *Revue Théosophique*, edited by myself, and managed by the Countess d'Adhémar; and now another heosophical magazine has appeared—*Le Lotus Bleu*—since March, also edited by myself, and managed by Arthur Arnould, a well-known journalist in Paris, and the president of the Thesophical Society of Paris, "l'Hermes." In New York we have *The Path*, whose editor, Mr. W. Q. Judge, publishes also a number of books and pamphlets. The existence of these centres shows undeniably that our movement is constantly on the increase, and that all interested and malicious reports to the contrary are without foundation.

But it is our Adyar Library, founded by the loving labor of our president, Colonel H. S. Olcott, which is the crown and glory of the Theosophical Society. Though only three years old, it has already acquired a large collection of Oriental works of the greatest value,—3,046 volumes,—besides over 2,000 works in European

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

languages, and a number of rare palm-leaf manuscripts. In the words of our learned librarian, Pundit N. Bhashyacharya: *

"In the department of Buddhistic literature it is richer than any library in India, and probably equal to most in Western countries.† Prominent among these works are: (1) The generous present of Mrs. Dias Ilangakoon, a Buddhist lady Theosophist, of Matara, Ceylon, a 'complete set of the Pali version of the *Tripitakas* engraved on palm leaves, and comprising sixty volumes, with nearly 5,000 pages. Twelve stylus-writers were employed during two years in copying the volumes from the unique collection at Merissa',—a collection that cost the donor rupees 3,500. (2) The Jodo sect of Japanese Buddhists presented Colonel Olcott 'with a complete set of the Chinese versions of the *Tripitakas* in 418 volumes, on silk paper.' . . . Other 'Japanese sects presenting him with 1,057 volumes' in all. (3) Twenty-two scroll paintings on silk and paper, . . . among which are two on silk that are said to be over 800 years old, and a MS. 350 years old, written in fine gold ink upon a scroll of some very *smooth black paper, 33 feet in length, and mounted on a roller.*"‡ etc.

Such are a few of the unique treasures in books and antiquities of the Adyar Library of the T. S., "got together under the greatest difficulties of total lack of pecuniary endowment and public patronage," and which "has received from no government as yet so much as a single book or one rupee." And that noble library will survive the founders and all present members of the Theosophical Society, and go on speaking of the work done when many other things are forgotten.

Having cast a hasty glance at the general aspect of the society as it stands at the present moment, I may be permitted to state very briefly the three broad principles upon which it is building up, and then recapitulate the results actually achieved under each heading.

The three officially-declared objects of our society are:

1. To form the nucleus of a universal brotherhood of humanity, without distinction of race, creed, sex, caste, or color.

2. To promote the study of Aryan and other Eastern literatures, religions, philosophies, and sciences.

* Unfortunately just dead.

† For particulars *vide* the learned and interesting article of Pundit N. Bhashyacharya, director of the Oriental Section of the Adyar Library, in *The Theosophist* for August, 1889.

‡ "There is also," writes the learned Brahmin librarian, "a large picture upon which, painted in vivid colors, . . . are 137 scenes in the life of the founder of the Jodo sect; . . . and an ancient biography of the Adept-Founder of the Yamabusi, or fraternity of phenomena-workers, and a scroll portrait of himself attended by some fire-elementals whom he seems to have subjugated to his trained will. Doctor Bigalow (late of Boston), now of Tokio, kindly gave a photograph of a bronze group representing Kobo-dai-shi, the Adept-Founder of Shin-zor sect, attended by two little *elementals*, who are serving him as messengers and domestics." All of which shows that the theosophical scapegoat, H. P. Blavatsky, has *invented* neither Adept fraternities nor "elementals," their existence having been known in Japan, China, and India for long centuries.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. A third object, pursued by a portion of the fellows of the society, is to investigate unexplained laws of nature and the psychic powers of man.

Two general objects, one restricted object, of attention. Every one entering the society is supposed to sympathize with the theory of essential brotherhood; a kinship which exists on the plane of the higher self, not on that of the racial, social, and mental dissimilarities and antipathies. These elements of discord pertain to the physical man and are the result of unequal development under the law of evolution. We believe the human body to be but the shell, cover, or veil of the real entity; and those who accept the esoteric philosophy and the theory of "Karma" (the universal law of ethical causation) believe that the entity, as it travels around certain major and minor cycles of existence with the whole mass of human beings, takes on a different body at birth, and shells it off at death, under the operation of this Karmic law. Yet though it may thus clothe and reclothe itself a thousand times in a series of reincarnations, the entity is unchanged and unchangeable, being of a divine nature, superior to all environments on the earthly plane. It is the physical body only which has racial type, color, sex, hatreds, ambitions, and loves. So then, when we postulate the idea of universal brotherhood, we wish it understood that it is held in no Utopian sense, though we do not dream of realizing it at once on the ordinary plane of social or national relations. Most assuredly, if this view of the kinship of all mankind could gain universal acceptance, the improved sense of moral responsibility it would engender would cause most social evils and international asperities to disappear; for a true altruism, instead of the present egoism, would be the rule the world over. So we have written down as the first of our declared objects this altruistic asseveration, and have been working practically to bring about a beginning of the better law.

The second of our declared objects speaks so plainly for itself that I need not dwell upon it, save in the most casual way. The founders of the Theosophical Society thought they had the best reason to believe that there existed, locked up in the ancient literatures of India, Ceylon, Tibet, China, Japan, and other Eastern countries, a very large body of truth which would be most important and valuable to the present generation, if it could be got at. The best agents to employ in this work were the Oriental scholars who knew the ancient languages, especially those—if any could be

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

found—who had learned the concealed meaning of the names, figures, and expressions with which Asiatic writings teem, and which are the despair of our Western Orientalists. These savants are priests of various religions and pandits, or professors, in a number of philosophical Eastern schools of thought. They had never before worked together in the interest of the whole family of mankind, so antagonistic are their personal views and so mutually contradictory their several religions and philosophical books. No scheme of coöperation between them could be carried out save upon the lines defined in our first declared object—that is to say, upon the theory of the universal relationship of all mankind on the plane of the higher self, and the policy of not meddling with what concerns only the mutual relations of the lower self, the physical man. It shall be shown presently how this part of our scheme has worked.

Observe the third declaration, that only a portion of our fellows occupy themselves with the study of the occult properties of matter and the psychical powers of man. The society as a whole, then, is not concerned in this branch of research. And naturally; for out of every ten thousand people one may meet, the chances are that but a very small minority have the time, taste, or ability to take up such delicate and baffling studies. Those who do are born mystics, and, of course, natural Theosophists; a Theosophist being one who seeks after divine wisdom—*i.e.*, the comprehension of the ultimate causes of force, correlation, and psychic development, the method of solving all life's riddles. Persons of this temperament cannot be bigots; they chafe under the sectarian yoke, and their hearts warm with sympathy for all who suffer, who groan under social burdens resulting from ignorance, for all of any race, creed, or color, who aspire after knowledge. These men are true Theosophists, the brothers of humanity, and, in their complete development, the spiritual exemplars, guides, teachers, benefactors, of our race. We thought it a good thing to proclaim this line of research and self-discovery as the third of our three objects. For those who are interested in it, and all inquirers whom they can reach and encourage, have the mystical philosophical books of the present and former times been written. To the general public these books are caviare.

Taking the three divisions of our objects in order, let us see what has actually been accomplished during the fourteen years of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Theosophical Society's existence. The compilation shall be made from official documents and be capable of verification at any time. First, as regards object number one, let it be noticed that we have done things on the broadest possible scale, dealing with nations in the mass as well as with individuals or small groups. Colonel Olcott and I removed from New York to Bombay at the beginning of the year 1878, at which time we had just established relations between Western students of Oriental mysticism, and a few educated Hindus and Sinhalese. In the East we found division between sects, castes, and races; the ancient religions neglected, and by the educated classes unappreciated; the pride of race, reverence for ancestors, and patriotic spirit almost extinguished. Now the traveller will be struck with the brotherliness which has begun to prevail; the resuscitation of interest in ancestral character, achievements, and literature; and a fervor of patriotism which has culminated in the formation of the Indian National Congress—a political body with which our society has no connection, though it was organized by our fellows, Indian and Anglo-Indian. Soon after our arrival at Bombay our society began to grow, branches rapidly sprang up, and it became necessary to hold annual conventions of delegates representing the now widely-expanded society. Responsive to the president's call, thirty-odd branches sent as their representatives Hindu, Parsi, Buddhist, Mohammedan, Hebrew, and Christian fellows to the first convention at Bombay. The spectacle was unique in Indian history, and provoked wide journalistic comment. At the public meeting in Framji Cavasji Institute the platform was successively occupied by speakers of the above-named religions, who vied with each other in fervent declarations of mutual tolerance and good-will, to the accompaniment of tumultous applause from the audience. Thus the clear note of universal brotherhood was struck and the evangel of religious tolerance declared in a part of the world where previously there had been only sectarian hatred and selfish class egotism. This was in 1882. Annually since then the convention has met as a parliamentary body to transact the society's business, and not the least sectarian or race discord has occurred. The whole of India became leavened with the benign influence emanating from these meetings, through the agency of the delegates in their respective states and nations; and when the political agitation began, the National Congress that was called was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modelled upon our lines, and officered and managed mainly by our own fellows who had served as delegates in our conventions.

Besides helping to weave this golden web of brotherhood throughout India, our society has extended its filaments from that centre to Ceylon, Burmah, Siam, and Japan, bringing these peoples into fraternal relations with the Hindus, though of a different religion, and creating channels for international intercourse upon religious and educational subjects. In those countries, also, we have sown the same seed of good-will, and in Ceylon we are already reaping the harvest. In that evergreen, paradisaical isle of the sea we have revived and begun to purify Buddhism, established high-schools, taken some fifty minor schools under our supervision, circulated literature in all parts of the island, induced the government to proclaim Buddha's birthday a public holiday, founded two journals, created a printing-office, and brought the Sinhalese Buddhists into direct relations with their Japanese co-religionists.

This is what we have done in India and the far East. As to Europe, as we began to work in earnest here only three years ago, the effects begin to be hardly perceived as yet. Still in London, in the very centre of the most luxurious materialism, we have founded in the East End the first Working-Woman's Club, wholly free from theological creeds and conditions. Hitherto all such efforts have been sectarian, and have imposed special religious beliefs: ours is based on *brotherhood* alone, and recognizes no differences in creed as a barrier. When the club opens, a few weeks hence, the members will find themselves in a bright and pleasant home, with books, papers, and music at hand, and a band of their better-educated sisters will take in rotation, night after night, the duty of helping and guiding—not controlling—the evening recreation. Only those who know the dreary lives of our poor East-End girls, with temptation lurking in every form of amusement within their reach, will understand the brotherly nature of the service thus rendered to them. We (the cultured classes) make outcasts of these less fortunate members of our family, set them in a special part of the town, amid squalid surroundings and coarsening influences; and we then complain that their roughness shocks our refinement, their brutality jars on our delicacy! Here, then, against class division,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as in India against caste division, the Theosophical Society proclaims the Brotherhood of Man.

As regards the revival of Oriental literature, the whole press of India, Ceylon, and Japan unqualifiedly give us the credit of having done more in that direction than any other agency of modern times. We have not only helped to revive in India the ancient *Tols*, or pandit-schools of Sanskrit literature and philosophy, and to reawaken reverence for the class of real Yogis, or saintly devotees, but we have created a demand for reprints and translations of ancient Sanskrit classics, which is being met by the frequent issue of works of this class at Calcutta, Bombay, Benares, Lucknow, Lahore, Madras, and other Indian literary centres.

Among the most important are the Vedas, Bhagavad Gita, the writings of Sankara, Patanjali, and other renowned Aryan philosophers and mystics. The Asiatic people have publicly testified most unqualifiedly their gratitude and respect to us for what we have done on the lines of the second of our declared objects. Nor should it be overlooked that the prevalent interest in theosophy and mystical Oriental philosophy in general, which the most casual observer is forced to see throughout Europe and America, is directly or indirectly the result of our society's activity. With thirty-eight branches in the United States, and others in various European countries, among whose members are men and women of high culture, including many writers for the press, it is easy enough to comprehend the justness of the above claim. Of course it is not for me to say how much, if anything, the books I have myself written, and the magazines I have edited and am editing in English and French, have helped to cause this new bent of the Western mind. Suffice it that it exists. For Theosophists it is the presage of the dawn of a new religious day for the world, the harbinger of a new marriage between science and religion, and of peace between the good people of the most incongruous sects—as the world thinks them.

Now as to the third object on our list. Properly speaking, the term "psychical research" should include the whole of the great movement known as modern spiritualism. But the subject is too vast to be dealt with in the closing paragraphs of an article. Suffice it to say that many investigators have been led to discriminate much more closely between the various classes of phenomena, while much has been done to weaken the sentimental,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but unphilosophical, superstition which made the "Spirits "of the departed the suffering spectators of the follies and crimes of the living. For details as to the conclusions we have arrived at on this subject, the reader must be referred to "The Key to Theosophy," wherein the question is dealt with at length. At least we may claim to have placed before the thinking public a logical, coherent, and philosophical scheme of man's origin, destiny, and evolution—a scheme preëminent above all for its rigorous adherence to justice. And, that we may broaden our criterion of truth, our research extends to an inquiry into the nature of the less known forces, cosmic and psychical. Upon such themes many of our books have been written, and many of our reprints of ancient works, with or without commentaries, have been selected with reference to the light they throw upon these *quæstiones vexatæ*.

In one word, our whole aim and desire are to help, in at least some degree, toward arriving at correct scientific views upon the nature of man, which carry with them the means of reconstructing for the present generation the deductive metaphysical or transcendental philosophy which alone is the firm, unshakable foundation of every religious philosophy. Theosophy, the universal solvent, is fulfilling its mission; the opalescent tints of the dawn of modern psychology are blending together, and will all be merged into the perfect daylight of truth, when the sun-orb of Eastern esotericism has mounted to its noon-stage. For many a long year the "great orphan," Humanity, has been crying aloud in the darkness for guidance and for light. Amid the increasing splendors of a progress purely material, of a science that nourished the intellect, but left the spirit to starve, Humanity, dimly feeling its origin and presaging its destiny, has stretched out towards the East empty hands that only a *spiritual* philosophy can fill. Aching from the divisions, the jealousies, the hatreds, that rend its very life, it has cried for some sure foundation on which to build the solidarity it senses, some metaphysical basis from which its loftiest social ideals may rise secure. Only the Masters of the Eastern wisdom can set that foundation, can satisfy at once the intellect and the spirit, can guide Humanity safely through the night to "the dawn of a larger day."

Such is the goal which theosophy has set itself to attain; such is the history of the modern movement; such is the work which theosophy has already accomplished in this nineteenth century.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"PROFESSIONALISM" IN SPORTS.

BY THE HON. THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

It is hardly necessary at the present day to enter a plea for athletic exercise and manly out-door sports. During the last twenty-five years there has been a wonderful growth of interest in and appreciation of healthy muscular amusements; and this growth can best be promoted by stimulating, within proper bounds, the spirit of rivalry on which all our games are based. The effect upon the physique of the sedentary classes, especially in the towns and cities, has already been very marked. We are much less liable than we were to reproaches on the score of our national ill health, of the bad constitutions of our men, and of the fragility and early decay of our women.

There are still plenty of people who look down on, as of little moment, the proper development of the body; but the men of good sense sympathize as little with these as they do with the even more noxious extremists who regard physical development as an end instead of a means. As a nation we have many tremendous problems to work out, and we need to bring every ounce of vital power possible to their solution. No people has ever yet done great and lasting work if its physical type was infirm and weak. Goodness and strength must go hand in hand if the Republic is to be preserved. The good man who is ready and able to strike a blow for the right, and to put down evil with the strong arm, is the citizen who deserves our most hearty respect. There is a certain tendency in the civilization of our time to underestimate or overlook the need of the virile, masterful qualities of the heart and mind which have built up and alone can maintain and defend this very civilization, and which generally go hand in hand with good health and the capacity to get the utmost possible use out of the body. There is no better way of counteracting this tendency than by en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

couraging bodily exercise, and especially the sports which develop such qualities as courage, resolution, and endurance.

The best of all sports for this purpose are those which follow the Macedonian rather than the Greek model: big-game hunting, mountaineering, the chase with horse and hound, and wilderness life with all its keen, hardy pleasures. The hunter and mountaineer lead healthier lives—in time of need they would make better soldiers—than the trained athlete. Nor need these pleasures be confined to the rich. The trouble with our men of small means is quite as often that they do not know how to enjoy pleasures lying at their doors as that they cannot afford them. From New York to Minneapolis, from Boston to San Francisco, there is no large city from which it is impossible to reach a tract of perfectly wild, wooded or mountainous land within forty-eight hours; and any two young men who can get a month's holiday in August or September cannot use it to better advantage than by tramping on foot, pack on back, over such a tract. Let them go alone; a season or two will teach them much woodcraft, and will enormously increase their stock of health, hardihood, and self-reliance. If one carries a light rifle or fowling-piece, and the other a fishing rod, they will soon learn to help fill out their own bill of fare. Of course they must expect to find the life pretty hard, and filled with disappointments at first; but the cost will be very trifling, and if they have courage, their reward is sure to come.

However, most of our people, whether from lack of means, time, or inclination, do not take to feats of this kind, and must get their fun and exercise in athletics proper. The years of late boyhood and early manhood—say from twelve or fourteen to twenty-eight or thirty, and often until much later—are those in which athletic sports prove not only most attractive, but also most beneficial to the individual and the race. In college—and in most of the schools which are preparatory for college—rowing, foot-ball, base-ball, running, jumping, sparring, and the like have assumed a constantly increasing prominence. Nor is this in any way a matter for regret. Of course any good is accompanied by some evil; and a small number of college boys, who would probably turn out badly anyhow, neglect everything for their sports, and so become of little use to themselves or any one else. But as a whole college life has been greatly the gainer by the change. Only a small proportion of college boys are going to become real

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

students and do original work in literature, science, or art; and these are certain to study their best in any event. The others are going into business or law or some kindred occupation; and these, of course, can study but little that will be directly of use to them in after-life. The college education of such men should be largely devoted to making them good citizens, and able to hold their own in the world; and character is far more important than intellect in making a man a good citizen or successful in his calling—meaning by character not only such qualities as honesty and truthfulness, but courage, perseverance, and self-reliance.

Now, athletic sports, if followed properly, and not elevated into a fetich, are admirable for developing character, besides bestowing on the participants an invaluable fund of health and strength. In each of the larger colleges there are from fifty to a hundred men who, on the various class and college crews and ball teams, or in the track and gymnasium games, compete for the different championships; and for every one such man who actually competes there are five or ten who take part in the practice games, train more or less, and get a great deal of benefit from the work. The careful system of measurements which have been taken at Harvard shows a marked improvement in the physique of the men even during the last ten years; and—what is more important—shows that this improvement is, if anything, more marked in the case of the average man than in that of the picked champions.

The colleges contain but a small proportion of the men interested in amateur athletics, as can be seen by the immense number of ball clubs, rowing clubs, polo clubs, hunt clubs, bicycle clubs, snow-shoe clubs, lacrosse clubs, and athletic clubs proper which are to be found scattered among our cities and towns. Almost any man of sedentary life who wishes to get exercise enough to keep him in vigorous health can readily do so at one of these clubs; and an increasing proportion of our young men are finding this out and acting accordingly. More than one of our most famous athletes originally took to athletics for his health; and, on the other hand, be it remembered always that the sports which prove most beneficial bodily to a man are those which interest and amuse him. If he belongs to a rowing club or base-ball nine, the eagerness and excitement of a contest with a rival association spur him on to keep his body in good condition; and, as with the college athletes, there are scores of outsiders, whom these championship contests

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attract, and whose love for athletics is increased thereby, for every individual contestant who directly participates in them. It is needless to say that under the head of manly sports I do not include pigeon-shooting; and still less rabbit-coursing, or any other game where the man does nothing but look on.

Already this awakening of interest in manly sports, this proper care of the body, have had a good effect upon our young men; but there are, of course, accompanying dangers in any such movement. With very few exceptions the man who makes some athletic pursuit his main business, instead of turning to it as a health-giving pastime, ceases to be a particularly useful citizen. Of course I do not refer to the men who act as trainers and instructors at the different colleges and clubs; these perform a most useful and honorable function, and among them several could be named who have rendered as high service as any men in the community.

But the amateur athlete who thinks of nothing but athletics, and makes it the serious business of his life, becomes a bore, if nothing worse. A young man who has broken a running or jumping record, who has stroked a winning club crew, or played on his college nine or eleven, has a distinct claim to our respect; but if, when middle-aged, he has still done nothing more in the world, he forfeits even this claim which he originally had.

It is so in an even more marked degree with the "professional" athlete. In America the difference between amateurs and professionals is in one way almost the reverse of what it is in England, and accords better with the ways of life of our democratic community. In England the average professional is a man who works for his living, and the average amateur is one who does not; whereas with us the amateur usually is, and always ought to be, a man who, like other American citizens, works hard at some regular calling,—it matters not what, so long as it is respectable,—while the professional is very apt to be a gentleman of more or less elegant leisure, aside from his special pursuit.

The mere statement of the difference is enough to show that the amateur, and not the professional, is the desirable citizen, the man who should be encouraged. Our object is to get as many of our people as possible to take part in manly, healthy, vigorous pastimes, which will benefit the whole nation; it is not to produce a limited class of athletes who shall make it the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business of their lives to do battle with one another for the popular amusement. Most masterful nations have shown a strong taste for manly sports. In the old days, when we ourselves were still a people of backwoodsmen, at every merrymaking there were sure to be trials of skill and strength, at running, wrestling, and rifle-shooting, among the young men. We should encourage by every method the spirit which makes such trials popular; it is a very excellent revival of old-time American ways. But the existence of a caste of gladiators in the midst of a population which does not itself participate in any manly sports is usually, as it was at Rome, a symptom of national decadence.

The Romans who, when the stern and simple strength of Rome was departing, flocked to the gladiatorial shows, were influenced only by a ferocious craving for bloody excitement; not by any sympathy with men of stout heart and tough sinew. So it is, to a lesser extent, to-day. In base-ball alone, the professional teams, from a number of causes, have preserved a fairly close connection with non-professional players, and have done good work in popularizing a most admirable and characteristic American game; but even here the outlook is now less favorable, and, aside from this one pastime, professionalism is the curse of many an athletic sport, and the chief obstacle to its healthy development. Professional rowing is under a dark cloud of suspicion because of the crooked practices which have disgraced it. Horse-racing is certainly not in an ideal condition. A prize-fight is simply brutal and degrading. The people who attend it, and make a hero of the prize-fighter, are,—excepting boys who go for fun and don't know any better,—to a very great extent, men who hover on the border-line of criminality; and those who are not are speedily brutalized, and are never rendered more manly. They form as ignoble a body as do the kindred frequenters of rat-pit and cock-pit. The prize-fighter and his fellow professional athletes of the same ilk are, together with their patrons in every rank of life, the very worst foes with whom the cause of general athletic development has to contend.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN INFLUENCE IN CHINA.

BY THE HON. JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG, EX-MINISTER TO CHINA.

THE declaration attributed to His Excellency, Li Hung Chang, the Premier of the Chinese cabinet, to the effect that the government contemplate retaliation upon Americans in China because of our legislation restricting the immigration of Chinese laborers to California, I should accept with reserve. The Premier must know that a course of reprisals toward Americans would be impossible in China. Most of the Americans in Peking are under the protection of international law, and if there were apprehensions as to Chinese good-will, they could easily go to Chefoo or Shanghai, and be near their own men-of-war. The open ports, Canton, Tientsin, Shanghai, and other places inhabited by foreigners have their own local governments; are "concessions," in fact, wherein the authority of China has no municipal recognition; and, as in Shanghai, the Chinese residents are protected, taxed, and governed. These ports are likewise under the constant supervision of foreign men-of-war. The missionaries in the interior might be disturbed, but the first note of danger would send them to the shelter of the open ports.

No measure of retaliation could be applied to Americans in China that did not apply to other nationalities. We have restricted Chinese immigration, but this has been done by Russia in her Asiatic dominions and by England in many of her colonies. The terms of these restrictions are not before me, but I have no doubt that, especially in Russia, they are more severe than in the United States.

There could be no retaliation that did not begin with the suspension of diplomatic relations between China and the United States, and the denunciation of existing treaties. Unless these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relations were abrogated, the "most-favored-nation clause" in our treaty would secure to Americans every right given to others. This extreme measure would be grave indeed, and I should hesitate to believe that it had ever been seriously considered by the Peking government.

As to business retaliation, boycotting, and so on, closing old markets and seeking new ones, I think that the Chinese, who are the shrewdest of merchants, will be governed by the good old law of supply and demand. They will buy in the cheapest and sell in the dearest markets. If money is to be made out of the Americans, their fine business instinct will not be disturbed by diplomatic emotions in Washington or Peking.

I should, furthermore, say that any such policy as is attributed to the Chinese Premier would be repugnant to China. The Chinese are not an aggressive people. They detest war, and teach their children to look upon the trade of the warrior as in no sense a holy calling. They have not, because of the dense ignorance of their heathenism, awakened to the dignity of that beautiful thought, which will come to them with the Beatitudes and Psalms of David, that man's chief end is to cut the throat of man; that the consummation of our noblest civilization is to be found in armaments; the burden of stupendous debts; a geography strewn with battle-fields; a history little more than chronicles of desolation and rapine. It may be as well that these benighted people should cherish their delusions, when we remember what was done by Mongol warriors in ancient days, and that Asia, under pressure and temptation, has developed the gravest problems of modern times.

This leads to a question of the deepest interest to Americans, a paramount question—namely, our relations with China. We hold towards that empire a unique relation. The youngest of civilizations is divided by a summer sea from the oldest: on one side of this ocean, what might be called an overflowing reservoir; on the other, an exhausted receiver. The laws of nature would seem to draw the keen-witted, thrifty millions of overpopulated China to the hungry acres of the United States. And this would be the result, making the American continent once more the home of the Mongolian, to the ultimate elimination of other races, but for the policy of the United States and British America.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That policy is no longer in debate. Were it otherwise, nothing is more certain than that in Peking, as well as in Washington, it is understood that the regulation of emigration is to be considered and determined in the friendliest manner; that China would aid rather than retard the work; that there never has been a time when China would not prefer absolute restriction to the slightest form of contingent emigration to the United States. It is in our own hands. There can be no measure of restriction too comprehensive for China. I might, perhaps, complete this observation by saying that, if a treaty of restriction would return every Chinaman to his own country and send every alien out of China, it would be hailed with joy throughout the Celestial Empire.

These are opinions formed during a prolonged residence in China, and under circumstances wherein I was honored with the friendship of the statesmen who govern that vast empire. It cannot be said with too much emphasis that no question as to emigration ever existed between China and the United States. Nothing is more wearisome than the endless declaration about the poor Chinese trying to unload their people on our shores. In 1884, acting under the orders of the government and in public service, I visited every port in China. I could not learn, nor do I think the records of the Peking legation will show, that a Chinese laborer ever emigrated from a Chinese port to the United States, or that the Chinese government ever contemplated such emigration except to prevent it.

Whence, then, does this immigration come? and what interest is served in its maintenance and growth? It comes from a British colony and is a British commercial interest—the most valuable incident in England's Chinese commerce except the monopoly in opium.

The island of Hong Kong, ceded to Great Britain as one of the perquisites of the ignominious opium war,—an area of about thirty square miles,—is separated from China by a narrow strait, and within a few hours by river of Canton, the capital of the Kwangtung and Hainan provinces, where reside a population of thirty millions. Canton itself is, I think, the largest of the Chinese cities. Hong Kong holds the same geographical relation to Canton that New York does to Albany, and has a population, say, perhaps of 160,000, of whom all but 10,000 are Chinese.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From this population, constantly recruited by river emigration from Canton, we have Chinese emigration to all parts of the world. The emigrants sail under the British flag and to British gain. China has no more to do with Hong Kong than with Dublin or Cardiff. As a traffic none has paid so well as the coolie business since the slave-trade. When we think of steamers crowded with Chinamen, going from Hong Kong to San Francisco, say from a thousand to twelve hundred laborers, each laborer paying fifty dollars for a passage, the net cost of transportation not more than ten, the gains can be appreciated. We can see how those who control so rich a trade defend it. The clamor that reaches the United States in regard to Chinese emigration; the ingeniously-continued articles in foreign newspapers; telegraphic despatches expressing the indignation of Li Hung Chang; indignation meetings in Canton; emotion among the Chinese as to their exclusion from America—all this literature of invective and remonstrance comes from English sources, comes as an expression of disappointment at the threatened suppression of a valuable trade.

I should regret if I failed to make this conviction clear to American readers, because it lies at the very root of this vexed question. It has been, as I have said, my privilege to have lived in terms of intimacy for years with the statesmen who govern China, to hold, as I do, many of them in terms of cherished and grateful friendship, to converse with them on many subjects—the problems of their own quaint and venerable civilization, the still greater problems involved in the push and go of the mighty West impending upon them from year to year, and disturbing the wisdom, the traditions, the piety, of ages. I can recall but one occasion when the question of emigration was ever mentioned by any minister. The Premier one day broached it in a spirit of half-remonstrance, as an offset or a demur to some claim I may have advanced on behalf of the United States. The tenor of my reply was that, as I knew neither His Excellency nor his government had any interest in the emigration question, as they had more immediate concerns than the commerce of Great Britian, any discussion of the theme would be a waste of time. There was a smile of assent. The subject dropped, never to be mentioned again.

I venture upon this personal incident, as it has, I think, a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pregnant meaning. It is not because of what America may or may not do in regard to immigration that our relations with China have become strained. But we have done things not in any way necessary, in a wanton, irregular fashion. We have, as in 1888, when the Exclusion Bill was passed, gone out of our way to offend a nation with whom we were on terms of peculiar friendship, with abuse. Our influence amounted virtually to a moral protectorate. Recalling the days of Burlingame, when the whisper of an American minister had more influence in the councils of Peking than the combined fleets of great powers, we can see what we have thrown away. The cynical thought has sometimes come to me, as I read debates and expositions on the Chinese question, that nothing could explain their course but an active interest in British commercial prosperity. If it had been the intention of those perfervid advocates to prevent a solution of the Chinese question; to weaken American influence in China; to postpone and perhaps destroy that development of our commerce with Asia which the greatness of our commonwealth on the Pacific demands; to make assured the commercial supremacy of Great Britain in Asia, they could not have labored to that end with more effectiveness and zeal.

American influence in China was not the work of a day, nor the inspiration of any political party or administration. It began with the subtle genius of Caleb Cushing, our first minister to China. It was developed by a succession of gifted gentlemen sent by some felicitous inspiration to represent American interests, and by the public spirit of commercial enterprise, the splendor of whose achievements might rival what was done by the East Indian Company. The extent of what was done cannot now be known, buried as it is in the archives of diplomacy and the ledgers of merchant princes who, from the days of John Jacob Astor and Stephen Girard, created and sustained the China trade. American influence in China was the work of Cushing, Alexander Everett, Humphrey Marshall, Robert M. McLane, William B. Reed, the illustrious Burlingame, that clear-minded and patient statesman, Governor Low, of California, of Seward and Angell and Dr. Williams. I write these names in a spirit of gratitude and reverence, as men whose names America will one day honor, when in the course of historial research the value of their work is known.

American influence was based upon American honor. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

could have no quarrel with China—no purposes of territorial aggrandizement. We had no long continuous frontier like Russia; no policy of an ever-extending empire like Great Britain; no emotional impulses towards colonial expansion, which so often have found pathetic expression in the seafaring adventures of France; no sudden awakening to the imperial dreams of Alexander, which disturbed Prince Bismarck, or the policy of the later rulers of Germany. We were the friends of China, nearer by sea than New York to Liverpool twenty years ago. We had been engaged in no impious opium war. It was our policy, I may say the law of the commercial existence of our Pacific empire, that the autonomy of China and Japan should be maintained; that the sphere of English influence in Asia should cease at Singapore; that even our traditional friendship with Russia would not win our assent to the closing-up to American enterprise of the markets of China, which would come with the advance of Russian dominion to Peking or Hankow. Therefore China, as was shown during her war with France, arising out of the melancholy French experiments in Tonquin, leaned upon the United States, and took her guidance even in matters leading to peace or war.

Nor would it be just for me to overlook what was done toward the consolidation of American influence in China by that illustrious and memorable citizen, General Grant. It was when in Tientsin, as the guest of the great viceroy, Li Hung Chang, that General Grant formed those conclusions in regard to what he believed should be the American policy towards China and Japan to which he never afterwards failed to give expression. I remember the earnestness with which he said at the time: "How I wish I could have known ten years ago what I have learned here." General Grant met in terms of familiar intercourse the princes and statesmen who govern China. He discussed with them every phase of their domestic and foreign policy. He saw, and pressed upon them, the development of their resources, and he learned of the incredible difficulties attending the attempt to introduce Western methods into so venerable and conservative a civilization. He realized, I believe, that while progress in the Mississippi valley might be that of the avalanche, in the valley of the Yangtze it could only be that of the glacier. He felt the meaning of the observation addressed to him one day by Li Hung Chang: "You gentlemen think we are moving too slowly. If we could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

take your pace and keep it, you would in twenty years complain that we were moving too rapidly." He laid it down as a fundamental principle of Oriental policy that between China and Japan there should be the closest alliance; that neither nation could have any part in the ventures of Western powers that would not in time do it harm. He formed the profound conviction that there was nothing of more importance to the peace and prosperity of many millions of men than that there should be between these Eastern nations and the United States, their near and powerful neighbor, such an understanding as would assure their independence, and give to the Pacific States of America the commercial supremacy which belongs to them. Nor do I think that any incident in the glorious career of Grant ever gave him more pleasure than that, as a private gentleman, after conversations with Prince Kung, then at the head of the Chinese government, and the lamented Iwakura, the Prime Minister of the Mikado, he was permitted to write the terms of arbitration which settled their differences about the Loo Choo Islands, and removed all danger of war between China and Japan. And when the mighty soldier at length found rest at Riverside, and it was proposed to build a monument to his memory, among the earliest subscriptions were those of Li Hung Chang and the Emperor of Japan.

That our influence should have been menaced, and perhaps overthrown, by such a measure as the Exclusion Bill of September, 1888, is one of those questionable tributes which we must on occasion pay for the blessings of a parliamentary government tempered by political audacity and ignorance. It was the outcome of the very wantonness of party desperation. It was our policy to exclude Chinese labor. The means for doing this came from the Chinese government in the form of a most effective treaty, representing as it did the traditional policy of the Chinese government—namely, that it wanted to keep its people at home. This treaty passed the Senate, with some indifferent amendments, which might as well have been omitted for the good or evil they did. Thus amended, it was necessary that the treaty should go to Peking for ultimate consideration. Bear in mind that this treaty was the work of the Chinese government; that it was a rigid measure of exclusion; that it was tendered by China in goodwill, and in recognition of economical perplexities in the United States. Its ratification in due course, even with the Senate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amendments, was a matter of form. Whether the cabinet of Peking took a long or short time to ratify was a minor consideration. We had no immediate interests, no burning issues, at stake; and China after other experiences with foreign powers, notably what is known as her Chefoo convention with Great Britain, knew that years might elapse before the ratification of a treaty between friendly powers, without peril to their relations. Nothing was more assured than the acceptance in spirit, and I think in the letter, of the convention of 1888.

It fell upon one of those unfortunate years in American history known as a presidential campaign, when the spirit of misrule and intrigue seems to ride the air. It was necessary to carry the Pacific coast for the Democracy; and how could that better be done than by an appeal to that curious phase of political emotional insanity supposed to pervade the Pacific States in regard to the Chinese?

The American Minister, Mr. Denby, the distinguished gentleman who now represents us in Peking, was instructed to say to the Peking cabinet that he must have an answer as to the fate of the treaty within forty-eight hours, and that, if no answer came, he could assume it had been rejected. If this note had been addressed to a European power, Mr. Denby would have received his passports, and serious explanations would have been requested at Washington. Even the meek, indifferent government of China could not respond to so rude a summons, and it was taken for granted that the treaty was rejected.

Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania, one of the ablest and most strenuous supporters of Mr. Cleveland, offered a bill in the House for the exclusion of the Chinese, on the assumed ground that China would not ratify any treaty to that end. We now see—what was doubtless well known to Mr. Scott and the administration—that this ground did not exist; that the Chinese government was only too anxious to assent to any treaty satisfactory to the United States. Mr. Scott must have known, or he could have learned the facts in three minutes by telephone from Mr. Bayard, that the convention was safe in the hands of China; that our relations with that power, so far as emigration was concerned, were coming to a satisfactory result through diplomacy; that Mr. Bayard himself, as a wise minister, had in his quiet way done more towards an amicable settlement than a thousand brawling politicians could

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have done in a thousand years; and that no other result could have followed the insult to China implied in a legislative measure which questioned her good faith than to overthrow the proud work of American influence in China, which we owed to the genius of men like Cushing, Burlingame, and Low.

The true policy of our country towards China should be based upon a generous recognition of her traditional friendship with the United States and a due consideration of the grave problems which attend the government of a vast, teeming, and, in many provinces, over-populated empire. We should have the same consideration for the susceptibilities and pride of the rulers of China that we show to other nations. We should defend the autonomy of the empire as strenuously as we maintain the Monroe Doctrine on the American continent, seeing in that an assurance of commercial greatness to our Pacific States. We should, if we could, encourage the rulers to some system of colonization under government control. I do not know how far this latter suggestion could take practical effect, but it is worth the trial.

Speaking to a distinguished Chinese statesman on one occasion, I referred to what had been done in the United States by Spanish and English, to the settlements at St. Augustine, Plymouth, and Jamestown, and thought that an outlet for Chinese energy could be found in Borneo, New Guinea, or on the banks of the Congo. "My people," he said, "do not create civilization. They follow and live upon it. They were never intended to make empires as you have made them." I have often thought of this as containing the essential truth of about all that could be written on the question of Chinese emigration.

JOHN RUSSELL YOUNG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IN WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

BY THE VERY REV. G. GRANVILLE BRADLEY, D.D., DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

IN THE summer of last year a large number of the leading representatives of various societies of American engineers were cordially welcomed and hospitably entertained in London by the well-known Institution of Civil Engineers, of which the chief founder was Thomas Telford, and which for fourscore years has had enrolled among its presidents and members the most distinguished names in the annals of British engineering and mechanical science. Among the various modes of entertainment provided for their guests by the president and council of the Institution was a visit to Westminster Abbey—a pilgrimage which few educated Americans would be willing to omit. As the number of visitors was far too large to be conducted in a single group through the various portions of the Abbey, it was suggested by the Dean of Westminster that the whole party should be invited to meet him in the Chapel of Henry VII., and that he should there endeavor to bring before them such of the historical and sacred associations of the chapel, and of the great church of which it forms a part, as were most likely to impress so unusual and so interesting an audience. It was, no doubt, the first occasion in the history of that far-famed chapel on which so large a party of educated Americans had met together beneath its roof. The following pages, which embody the principal topics that would naturally be brought before such visitors at such a time and in such a place, may be of interest to a wider circle than that to which the address referred to was originally delivered.

It was, I think I may venture to say, by a happy accident that the thought suggested itself, some months ago, of inviting the American representatives of a great profession to meet the present guardian of Westminster Abbey in the Chapel (as we are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

accustomed to call it) of Henry VII.* It was not easy to realize at the moment the full and significant, the almost strange, appropriateness of the place, which was named, in the first instance, mainly on the ground of its being at once convenient and interesting to such honored visitors. I shall have no difficulty in convincing an American reader that it would have been hard to select, after the most careful consideration, a spot so singularly suggestive for such a gathering. Let him think for a moment of the time† at which its walls were raised, when they and that wondrous roof took the place of the humbler and narrower "Chapel of Our Lady" which had stood for nearly three centuries as an adjunct to the great church hard by, and which was destroyed as ruthlessly by Henry VII. as was the Norman fabric of the Confessor, within two centuries of its completion, by Henry's ancestor, the third of that name. It was a time that marked the transition from those middle ages—to which belonged both the church of the Confessor and the stately fabric which took its place—to the modern world of which Americans and Englishmen are alike the children.

It is not merely that the style of architecture of that Tudor age is in almost every detail, as in its general effect, wholly different from that which the visitor leaves behind him as he passes within its open gates. But from the moment that its first stone was laid, at the beginning of the eventful sixteenth century, to that of its completion, some years after its founder had been laid in his grave beneath its floor, the air of England and of Europe was full of the germs of changes whose results, so manifold, so far-reaching, were as yet quite unrecognized. The old world was in travail: what its progeny should be it knew not. The shrewd, suspicious, and cautious sovereign who designed and raised the fabric could not read the future. Infinite were the pains he took to provide for perpetual masses to be sung for his soul, "while

* Strictly speaking, the Chapel of Henry VII. is a lady chapel, or chapel dedicated to the Virgin Mary, and, as such, is attached to the eastern extremity of the church of the monastery, or abbey, of Westminster, which was itself dedicated to St. Peter, and by a time-honored misnomer is popularly called "The Abbey." Such a chapel had been added to the Norman church of Edward the Confessor in the early part of Henry III.'s reign, nominally by the King, but mainly by the exertions of Richard de Berkynge, abbot from 1222 to 1246. The original lady chapel was, therefore, the oldest part of the abbey church, as it existed when Henry VII. came to the throne.

† The first stone was laid January 24, 1503. The walls and roof were, no doubt, completed by 1509, in the April of which year the King died.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the world shall endure,"* by monks whom, a generation later, his son and successor was to disinherit. He crowded the walls of the building that bears his name with the effigies in stone of early and mediæval saints,† whose worship was soon to be forbidden, whose very names were to be half-forgotten. Almost his last offerings to adorn its altar were two gifts that spoke of unabated credulity in an age when an Erasmus was already branding with gentle scorn all such spurious specimens of the bones of saints or of more sacred relics. A so-called leg-bone of St. George,‡ a few so-called drops of the Saviour's blood, were to give a special sanctity to the altar which was to be raised above his grave.§ Yet within a walk of a few minutes from that very spot a Caxton‖ had already carried to completion his work at his printing-press, within the Abbey precincts, in the almonry of the great Benedictine Monastery of which that historic church was but a portion. He had already placed in English hands the results of the great invention that by slow degrees was to bring all literature and all knowledge within the reach, not of the few, but of the many, and which, by diffusing a knowledge of Holy Scripture and by familiarizing the mind of the coming age with the stirring thoughts of the leaders and teachers of mankind, was to play such a mighty part in the awakening of the conscience and intellect of the world.

It was a time when the keels of the little ships of the Genoese Columbus had already ploughed the waters of a new world—need I say with what momentous results? Already from the port of Bristol the Venetian Cabot had penetrated the icebergs of Labrador up to the very coast of America.¶ Before the roof of Henry VII.'s Chapel was completed the merchant fleets of the golden age of Portugal had doubled the Cape, and their flags were flying in the ports of India. Balboa was soon to climb the

* See the indentures between the King and the abbot and convent as given in Neale.

† Of these no less than ninety-five still remain.

‡ See extract from Henry VII.'s will. "Our grate pece of the holie crosse . . . and also the preciouse relique of oon of the leggs of Saint George, set in silver parcel-gilt." Quoted in Nichols's edition of Erasmus's "Pilgrimages."

§ *I. e.*, the Jesus altar, which was to be placed at the east end of his tomb.

‖ Caxton's press was set up in 1471 under Abbot Millyng. His chief friend was Abbot Esterey, 1471-1498.

¶ Columbus died while the chapel was building, A. D. 1506. The date of Cabot's voyage from Bristol was 1497 A. D.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heights from which he could look down on the waters of the Pacific. Cortes,* with his handful of adventurous Spaniards, was to cross the Atlantic and master the feeble civilization of Mexico.

Already, in short, those mighty changes were in progress which in due time were to shift the central highway of commerce and civilization from the Mediterranean Sea to the Atlantic Ocean, and which in due time, also, were to work out the transformation of England from the home of a pastoral, agricultural, and military race to that of a swarming, industrial, maritime, and colonizing population. A silent teaching was being mutely preached, even while those walls were rising, which was to lead her no longer to waste her strength in misleading efforts to realize her dream of supremacy in France, as still symbolized in the *fleur de lys* on these entrance gates,† but to train her to fulfil her true destiny, and to become the fruitful mother of free and mighty nations. I need not dwell on other impending changes; on that other birth with which the age was in travail; how the calmer voices of the English Colet and of the Dutch Erasmus,‡ as one or the other smiled sadly at the jewelled relics of the shrine at Canterbury, or sighed for the day "when the weakest woman should read in her own tongue the word of God," or pleaded against the multiplication of councils and dogmas, and in favor of setting Christ himself in the place which the church had usurped—how these were soon to be lost in the thunder of the voice of Luther, or drowned in the din of all the fierce and far-reaching struggles of the Reformation era.

They have, one and all, left their traces around the visitor who stands on that chapel floor. There, in the vault of its founder, beneath the tomb and effigies which we owe to the master hand of Torregiano, sleeps the James, King at once of England and of Scotland, to whose reign we owe, with all its incalculable results, our English version of the Bible. There, at the head of the same vault, lies beneath the altar§—once desecrated, now restored—the

* Balboa, 1513. Conquest of Mexico, 1519–21.

† The *fleur de lys* of France is conspicuous among the interesting devices on the gate of the Chapel of Henry VII.

‡ See Green's "History of England," pp. 299, 306; also, Nichols's edition of Erasmus's "Pilgrimages."

§ The high altar of the chapel was the last of the three works carried out by the Italian artist, Torregiano, who had already completed the tomb and effigies of Henry VII. and his Queen, and that of Margaret Beaufort, Countess of Richmond

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

body of the Protestant boy-King, the founder's grandson, Edward VI. He was laid in his grave with no mediæval dirge and Latin requiem, but with the then unfamiliar words of our now familiar burial service. The solemn "earth to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust," was to pass from the lips of the Cranmer with whose preaching the pulpit so near his grave is traditionally associated, and who was soon to follow his young King to the unseen world through the gate of a death of torture.

I hope I have not lingered too long over thoughts impossible to repress in connection with those to whom a visit to such a spot must have a special interest,—visitors shall I call them, or pilgrims?—whose homes lie beyond an ocean that no longer estranges; men and women who share our ancient memories, and whose fathers for centuries breathed the air, and rested at last beneath the soil, of our own island home. No spot in that great Abbey can be to them more deeply interesting.

And now it may be worth while to point out to any reader such as these a few of the more direct and less general associations of this same chapel, in which he may imagine himself to be seated. As he passes within its open gates, with their ornamental work of ancient bronze, he may read something of the ideas that filled its founder's brain as he designed and planned it. There he may pause for a moment to decipher the symbols that still tell, not only of the idle dream of recovering the throne of France, which he claimed as being the grandchild of the daughter of France, the widow of its conqueror, Henry V., but of something far more real and far more substantial. In that Portcullis of Lancaster, that Fetterlock of York, may be read the peaceful union of the two rival houses of York and Lancaster, the close of the Wars of the Roses, in which the feudal baronage of England had dashed itself to pieces in savage battles, in ruthless slaughter, and on bloody scaffolds. Few of us but can recall Shakespeare's*

> "shadow like an angel, with bright hair
> Dabbled in blood,"

or the mother's lament over her two "unblown flowers," cut off so

and Derby, in the south aisle. It was placed beneath a canopy, supported on four pillars, with an angel at each corner, displaying "the instruments of the Passion." It was probably completed in 1519, and was destroyed in 1643 under the direction of a committee appointed by the Long Parliament to demolish "monuments of idolatry." The altar as it stands was replaced in 1879.

* "Richard III." Act. i., Sc. 4; *id.*, Act iv., Sc. 4.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

early, whose bones still lie in the compass of one urn in "the Innocents' Corner" in the northern aisle. High up on the same gates, as in the eastern window, stands the device of the crown placed on the thorn bush that spoke of the kingdom as won neither by inheritance nor yet by marriage, but by "the judgment of God,"* on the field of Bosworth. So on the fair "closure" that surrounds the founder's tomb we may observe the dragon that silently asserts the claim of the son of the Welsh Tudor to share the blood of the mythical King Arthur and of the ancient British monarchs. We may remember also, as we examine that monument of Torregiano's art, that the three coffins underneath it mark the long-delayed and peaceful consolidation of the whole island in which our fathers lived — a consolidation marked by the accession to the throne of England first of a Welsh and secondly of a Scottish king. And from this grave we may pass with redoubled interest to the ancient chapel of the Confessor in the great church below, where for three centuries hung, hard by the shrine of the the meek royal saint, the golden circlet torn from the head of the last Welsh king, and the "stone of fate" wrested from untamable Scotland by the Edward who sleeps so near it; and whatever blood runs in our veins, Scottish or Welsh or English, we may feel that this chapel breathes a message of peace to all those ancient symbols of the discord of centuries.

But these are mere fragments of the associations that swarm around the visitor to this Tudor chapel. Here in its northern aisle lie side by side the coffins of two sisters—the great Elizabeth, whose memory is cherished in the name of the State of Virginia, and the unloved and unhappy Mary. There in its southern aisle, close to the kneeling figure of her murdered husband, Darnley, is the effigy of the Mary, Queen of Scots, whose death-warrant Elizabeth signed. Their spirits are with the Father of all spirits: their bodies rest beneath the same roof in this "temple of reconciliation and peace." There in the same grave sleeps, amidst the wreck of the Stuart race, the Prince Rupert whose headstrong charges broke in vain against the steadfast courage of Cromwell and his Ironsides. Beneath the feet of those who tread this floor still sleeps the much-loved daughter of Cromwell,† amidst the

* "The crowne which it pleased God to geve us with the victorie of our enemy at our first felde." Henry VII.'s will.

† Elizabeth Claypole, buried August 10, 1656.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

graves of kings—of the Cromwell who was laid to his rest in kingly pomp beneath its eastern window. Hard by, and side by side with the Stuarts from whom she sprung, lies the ancestress* of the House of Hanover. Almost in its centre sleeps the Hanoverian King, George II., his dust mingling with that of the good Queen Caroline. Beneath the same pavement are the graves of one after another of the same dynasty; among them that of the Cumberland who broke the hopes of the Stuarts on the bloody moor of Culloden. These are only some of the memories which this chapel evokes. It covers the dust alike of Charles II., of William III. and of Queen Mary, and of Queen Anne, her husband, and their offspring. Yet I cannot turn from it without reminding my readers that it includes among its treasures the grave of my beloved and lamented predecessor, the Arthur Stanley who was as dear to the heart of America as to that of England, or without calling attention to the window that he raised to the memory of his wife, herself of the race of the Robert Bruce of Bannockburn, where the sun setting in the far west still speaks of a tie† that bound them to lands and communities that lie beyond the ocean.

And which shall I mention of the innumerable points of interest in the great church itself, through which the visitor will pass as he leaves this chapel? Shall I speak of the graves of its early kings, where, round the shrine that holds the bones of the Confessor, sleep—not, as here, in vaults beneath the pavement, but above ground in their marble tombs—the third Henry, who raised that church of such peerless beauty and built that "incomparable" chapter-house; the Edward whose trophies torn from Wales and Scotland I have just mentioned; his grandson, the third Edward, who began the century of long and terrible wars with France; the ill-starred Richard II., whose youthful portrait still hangs upon our walls, and whose bones were at last brought to their long home by his remorseful conqueror; the fifth Henry, above whose headless effigy still rises the fair chantry raised to his memory by the wife and child from whom Death so soon divided him, and still hang the shield and helmet and saddle

* Elizabeth, wife of the Elector Palatine, eldest daughter of James I, grandmother of George I.

† Lord Elgin, Lady Augusta Stanley's brother, was Governor-General of Canada from 1846 to 1855. Her second brother, Sir F. Bruce, was for some years a representative of Great Britain at Washington.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that tell of the day of Agincourt? There, too, rest at last the bones of his wife, the descendant of St. Louis, from whose second marriage sprung the father of the first Tudor king, of whose work here we have already spoken.

I must not linger over these memories of an unforgotten past. But I may remind those who enter that great church by its northern transept that they tread, perhaps unconsciously, on the dust of statesmen who bear names as familiar to Americans as to ourselves; of a Grattan, a Castlereagh, of two Pitts, and of Charles James Fox. Above them rise the statues not only of a Peel, a Beaconsfield, a Palmerston, the three Cannings, but one commanding figure with arm outstretched looks down upon the visitor as he passes through the northern entrance. It represents the dominating figure of the middle period of the last century, of the epoch of which the great transatlantic republic was the latest birth; the statesman whose greatness is identified with the expansion of Great Britain. It is the Chatham to whose sagacity we owe the choice of Wolfe and the end of that strife that was decided on the Heights of Abraham. You may see him there, that maker of the greatness of a greater Britain, with eagle countenance and eager gesture, as though still not merely hurling defiance at his country's foes, but uttering his memorable pleading for what he believed to be the righteous cause of the yet unborn republic beyond the seas.

As we pass from the Tudor chapel to that northern transept, we may pause before the huge and towering memorial of the dying Wolfe; of him to whose dear-bought victory we might almost say that we owe the momentous—let me use once more the word—the momentous result that English—not French—is the speech, English—not French—the race, of the masters of North America. Or if we cross then towards the southern transept, we may stay our steps at the spot where, from the days of the Norman Conqueror, every sovereign of England has received the crown; and we may pause for a moment at the place where our Queen, honored in America as in her own realm, gave thanks amidst her children and her children's children, and surrounded by 10,000 of her people, for fifty years of beneficent rule. We may pass onwards by the bust of Dryden to the bust of Longfellow, dear to England as to his own people. All around us are the graves or the memorials of poets, of writers, and of thinkers,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the tomb of Chaucer, who was laid to rest five hundred years ago, to that of Charles Dickens, into whose still open grave poor men and women and children threw their offerings of summer flowers, scarcely twenty summers before these pages will appear.*

A few steps will lead us from Poets' Corner to the nave. There, amidst the memorials of gallant soldiers and sailors, whose stubborn heroism built up in later days the English empire, we shall notice the monument of André, with its fair crown of American autumn leaves, symbolizing the healing of the long-past bitterness of an almost civil strife. There, too, we may note the one spot on consecrated English walls that contains an effigy of Washington. Thence we may cross to the monument —removed of late in order to be placed within the reach of every American visitor—of the young Howe who fell on the march to Ticonderoga; raised to him by a grateful "Province of Massachusetts" not yet divided from the realm of England. Or we may enter the dim baptistery and, above the effigy of Wordsworth, the bust of Keble, and the memorial of the blind Fawcett, raise our eyes to the window placed in memory of two sacred poets† of this his mother-land by a citizen of Philadelphia.

It would be easy to say much more that would have a special interest for visitors to the Abbey from that great republic whose territory seems to us—shut within the narrow limits of our four seas—almost boundless, and whose population is already five times greater than was that of this island two centuries ago. I would only remind the citizens of the United States that the link which enables you to bind together in one nation under one government that vast republic, came to you, we might almost say, as a legacy from these very precincts. Enter that "incomparable" chapter-house, among whose storied windows is one that bears the stars and stripes that mark it as a gift from your own country, and you will place your feet upon the floor where for three centuries met the "knights and burgesses" of England. You

* Charles Dickens was buried in Poets' Corner at an early hour on June 14, 1870. The funeral was, in accordance with the urgent injunctions of his will, strictly private. The grave, however, was, by Dean Stanley's desire, left open for the day, and was soon filled with wreaths and flowers, largely contributed by visitors of the humblest class.

† The window to the memory of George Herbert and William Cowper was the gift of Mr. Childs, of Philadelphia.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will see before you the very nursery of the first-born child that embodied the then novel conception of representative government—the very cradle in which was rocked the institution that has become the august mother of many parliaments in many lands.

And yet I have not said one word of the great profession a visit from whose American representatives to the Abbey of Westminster suggested these remarks,—a profession whose mighty progress has done so much, even in the memory of men still living, to change the material and influence the moral condition of the whole civilized world. It is enough to remind all members of that body that here, too, in this great Abbey they may visit not only the graves of a Newton, a Herschel, a Lyell, and a Darwin. They will find the gigantic statue of a James Watt in a strange proximity, so characteristic of the place, to the grave of the standard-bearer of Henry V. and the restored tomb of the chamberlain of the seventh Henry. Or they may pass by the monument of a De Vere to the statue of Telford, builder of bridges, maker of highways, leader for a while of English engineers; and, near Telford's grave, they may stand by the gravestone of Robert Stephenson, or pause beneath the windows raised to the memory of Brunel and Locke and Stephenson and Siemens, and last of all to that of the Cornish genius, Richard Trevithick.

Enough has been said. A building whose historical associations, apart from its legends and traditions, extend in an unbroken line through eight centuries, and through which the current of English history has flowed, leaving traces at every generation on its walls and floors, may excuse some prolixity in a vain attempt to touch even a very few of its leading features. Through all that time it has been, still is, and I trust may long remain, no mere house of tombs, no mausoleum, or museum, or Walhalla, but a Christian church, the house of God, sacred in the eyes of thousands as the national sanctuary of our race. The famous chapel that marks its eastern extremity was once consecrated to the worship of her whom men then hailed as the Queen of Heaven; whom we are content to honor as the human mother of our Saviour Christ. You may see even now on its western wall some tokens of that ceremony of consecration of "this Chapel of Our Lady," as its founder called it. For ages the roof of the greater church, itself dedicated to the Fisherman of the Galilean Sea, rang to daily and nightly services, chanted in Latin

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by black-cowled monks, or to Latin masses celebrated by gorgeously-vested priests. For three long centuries our English liturgy has been in daily use. If, as is natural, but a limited number of worshippers are usually present at its morning services, you may see its seats well filled at a later hour, and crowded to excess at every service on the Lord's Day; and you may hear the sound of the familiar English hymn pealed forth by hundreds of voices of reverent worshippers, gathered from all parts of our own kingdom and of the English-speaking world.

May it long serve many uses! May it gather together earnest seekers after God, and aid them by spoken words, by devout worship, by inspiring music, in lifting their thoughts to a world unseen! And may it continue to awaken in thousands, who under our own and far-off skies speak our tongue, a growing interest in its ancient memories; a sense of all we owe to times long left behind; a sense that among God's best gifts to man is that of the example and the leading and the teaching of mighty genius and of surpassing goodness; of those who have received largely and rightly used those high gifts which come down from the Father of lights, the Giver of every good gift and every perfect gift, in whom, whatever the changes that Time works on human history, is no variableness nor shadow of turning!

G. G. BRADLEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CAPTURE OF CANADA.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

IT SEEMS now, in the natural order of things in the United States, that Canada should be captured. With armed cruisers in the St. Lawrence watching the fishermen of the United States, who are compelled to take out licenses from a foreign government to authorize them to pursue their peaceful vocation; with the assembling of a fleet of armed vessels from both countries in Bering Straits to detect or protect Canadian sealers; with rumors of great military preparations, and increase of defensive armament; the arrival of torpedo-boats; the construction of the Bermuda cable, justified only by war purposes; and other unusual movements in times of peace, it is no wonder that the people of the United States are somewhat startled, and that the question is asked, "Has not the time for the capture of Canada come?"

No one dreams of war for this purpose. No other two nations have interests so identical, and there are none whose future is so wrapt up in each other's peace and prosperity, as Great Britain and the United States. There never was less inclination apparent among any people than among those of the United States for the acquirement of additional territory by the aid of the sword. There is, however, a great desire—nay, a great necessity—for an expansion of their trade to continental dimensions; and if Canada can be commercially captured by the peaceful means of policy, it is a clear duty to capture her in that way. If the enormous resources of this "Greater Half of the Continent" can be made tributary to the progress of the United States by legislation, by occupancy through individual purchase, by development, and by the creation of a mutuality of interests, it would seem to be the very best form of statesmanship to achieve that result. The time and the circumstances are extremely favorable to accomplish this purpose, and if the military preparations have the effect of directing atten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion to the question of the possibility of a peaceful capture, they will not have been in vain.

But there are other influences than military preparation at work to enforce the conviction that Canada is essential to the United States. The tier of territorial commonwealths along the northern border of the Republic are now admitted to statehood, and the limitation of new territory in the North, as in the South, is quite as marked as that on the Pacific in the West or on the Atlantic on the East. The boundaries of the great Republic are all fixed and determined, and no more area for expansion except from within the United States seems possible. If more breathing space for this vast and growing aggregation of humanity is needed, it must be towards the north, or towards the south; and all the circumstances, all the tendencies and influences, point most unerringly towards the north.

The commercial equipment of the period is on the basis of occupation of new territory. The railroad-builders, the locomotive-makers, the steel-rail mills, the coal-shippers, and men in ten thousand other industries, if they are to be employed, must get into new territory, or else greatly restrict the activity that has hitherto prevailed. New territory is equally needed for occupation for a never-ceasing increase of population, produced both from enormous immigration and from natural increase. The development of natural resources in new regions, which has been so constant up to this period, and which has contributed in so large a degree to the growth and wealth of the country, must still continue. But this activity must find new fields. If the expansion of commerce as shown in the growth of internal trade, which the new census will reveal as the most marvellous phenomenon that the statistical world has ever seen, is to suddenly cease, and the increase hereafter confine itself to the limits of the Union as it already exists, it would seem as if a period of decadence in statistical increase might now commence. The ratio of increase of wealth, in extent of trade, which the last two decades of the nineteenth century will show, cannot be maintained in the first two decades of the twentieth century without wider area and enlarged resources.

It seems incredible that, without more room for expansion, without the occupation of greater territory, and without further development of great natural wealth, the same pace of increase

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can be maintained. If, for instance, nearly all the coal mines of the United States are in possession of various railroad companies, what chance is there for the new generation of coal-miners to make a profit, except as delvers in the bowels of the earth in the pay of other people? If all the iron and copper mines are pre-ëmpted, the opportunities of those that come hereafter and want to develop iron and copper mines will be restricted. The Calumet and Hecla Mine and the Anaconda Mine are each difficult to duplicate within the area of the United States, and the children of the present generation who want to dig for iron and copper must go elsewhere, or fail in the attempt, unless the rest of the continent is opened up, in which there are abundant chances for the discovery and development of iron and copper, as, indeed, for every other factor and opportunity that have thus far stimulated and sustained the American people in their rapid race for wealth and greatness.

Especially of timber is this true. A considerable portion of the community have made money by the manufacture and handling of timber and lumber, and this cannot be duplicated in the next generation, unless a supply of these articles is to be had. The exhaustion of the forests of Maine, the disappearance of the forests of the Saginaw valley, and the utter disregard for the future by which the policy of protection has stimulated the policy of destruction, will in a quarter of a century result in denuding vast areas of the United States of the timber supply available within reasonable reach of its great points of demand. All the industries dependent upon timber, if they are to grow in the next twenty years, will need new resources for the supply of the raw material.

Whence can these be obtained except from the portion of the continent outside of the United States? This question needs an answer after much thought, and after the full realization of the fact that there is to-day standing in Germany—a completed country—a larger supply of timber *per capita* than there is in the United States—a country in which the growth and creation of homes are an essential element of progress. When one recalls the vast stretches of treeless prairies within the United States, in which shelter must be provided, the necessities and exhaustion of rainless regions resulting from the destruction of the forests, and the rapid growth of vast cities on the lakes and plains, and also the fact that from the northern part of the continent alone

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a supply of timber certain for all future time, the necessity for the extension of commerce so as to include these areas is apparent.

But it is not alone as a source of supply that an increased area is needed for the United States, in which the energies of the people may be employed, as in mineral or in forest wealth. The exhaustion of wheat lands is a consideration of the most vital import in relation to the future supply of the food of this continent. It is a startling fact, not yet fully realized by the people of this country, that within fifty years, at the present rate of procedure, the United States may be a large importer of breadstuffs. The growth of population is so rapid, the exhaustion of the arable land so constant, that without new and cultivable territory the sources for the supply of food products will soon be below even the local demand. The steady trend of wheat-production to the northern tier of States is one of the most marked features of the time, and the fact that the wheat of the continent is now derived from a narrow belt in its extreme northern half is significant testimony to the necessity of larger wheat areas than are now possessed within the Union. When it is recalled that the best wheat producing region of the world is found just north of the Minnesota line, and that in the new provinces and territories of the Canadian Northwest there is a possible wheat supply for all time, it will be seen how important has been the provision of nature for the food of mankind.

It is not, however, in minerals, in timber, or in wheat areas alone that the necessity exists for the employment of the rapidly-increasing numbers of the people of this country. Cheap food for New England is the necessity of the hour in that region. If the New England States are to maintain themselves in the great competitive struggle which has set in in the Southern and Western States, and in which is threatened the extinction of one-half of the existing industries in cotton, iron, and other staples, the essential element of success will be a cheap and near-by supply of raw material, and a certainty of food for New England artisans at the lowest possible rate. Competition between various sections of the country is just as severe in its effects on those regions that are placed at a disadvantage as if the competition came from abroad. The employers and laborers in the New England States suffer as much from the disadvantage of location

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as they would from the pauper labor of Europe, and provision against pauper labor is not more earnestly called for than provision against adverse location.

If the Southern and Western States are to control the market of the West and East by the fact that coal, iron, and cheap food are side by side, then must New England be cared for in an equal degree, for the geographical and physical advantage which these States possess can be equalled in New England for foreign trade by the opening-up of the adjacent territories included within the Maritime Provinces. Here are abundant supplies of coal and iron within an area in which the charge for freight ranges from seventy-five cents to one dollar per ton. Here also in the Maritime Provinces are abundant sources of food supply. No other country in the world can produce potatoes, apples, oats, hay, poultry, dairy produce, and, still more important, the finest fish food, equal to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward's Island. No region has produced a better class of cheap labor, intelligent, contented, and industrious, than has Quebec. Every element of success which the Eastern States need in order to compete with an outside market like Great Britain and Germany, the Maritime Provinces and Quebec can furnish.

Without these cheapened supplies of raw material, without decreased cost of living, competition even for the markets of the Western States is simply out of the question, while manufacturing for foreign markets is equally impossible. In the unlimited supply of cheap raw material from Canada, in the unrestricted output of fish and food products, and the constant employment of the cheap labor from the North, the new hope of New England may be found. Without these her manufacturing prospects are gloomy indeed.

On the Pacific coast an equally advantageous result would follow in the matter of coal. The supplies of California must be drawn from British Columbia, while midway across the continent the construction of railroads running north to sources of coal supply already indicates the absolute necessity for an interchange of this natural product. Canada is possessed of 97,000 square miles of coal territory, and coal, equally with her timber, her fish, her iron, copper, and silver, affords a field for development and business activity that is nowhere surpassed. The spectacle is presented in the old world of the two nations of Great Britain and Germany

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dividing between them the Dark Continent of Africa for the purposes of the creation of trade. On this hemisphere no such contest is needed, for the greater half of North America, so far as trade and commerce are concerned, is immediately available for the enterprise and energy of the people of the United States.

It may be asked how such a result as the commercial capture of Canada can be accomplished in the face of the passage of the McKinley Bill, on the one hand, and the enforcement of an equal prohibitory tariff by the Canadian government, on the other. The barbed-wire fence which has hitherto run athwart the continent is now to be higher than ever; and the typical two brothers on different sides of an imaginary line, who want to trade a bushel of potatoes for a bushel of apples, will encounter greater difficulty than ever before in effecting the exchange. Under the new tariff each will be compelled to pay a paternal government twenty-five cents for the privilege—a sum double the cost of these two products of nature. But the hope of the hour is that the very extreme point which the two tariffs have reached has startled both people and made them realize the folly of this practical prohibition of trade. So far as the people of the United States are concerned, it is apparent that the paltry five millions of dollars which has hitherto been collected on Canadian products has been an utterly unnecessary and unwise exaction. Divided up between the population, it is less than ten cents per head, and yet for this miserable trifle the sources of supply of half a continent have been stopped, and the market within a great and growing nation next door to the United States has been denied.

True, the McKinley Bill may increase the amount so levied, so that each individual in the United States will be "benefited by taxation" to the extent of twenty-five cents per head, instead of ten cents, on Canadian agricultural products. But the "protection" afforded is so meagre, the principle of shutting out the products of the earth and the sea so wrong, and the necessity for cheap food in New England and the Middle States so great, that no one for a moment can justify the continuance of a tariff against the palpable interests of the United States, and equally against those of Canada. Indeed, it is a universal admission that the McKinley Bill has not been specially aimed at Canada. Although its agricultural sections will seriously threaten the solvency of her farmers, its burdens will be shared by the consumers of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New England and the Middle States, where cheap food and free raw material are essential elements of prosperity.

But the enforcement of the McKinley tariff in Canada will have an effect of a most startling character. Already the producers of that country have seen the folly of building up a barrier between them and their brethren across the border—against people of the same lineage, the same language, the same literature, and governed by the same laws. This barrier, even at its former height, has been a difficult one to contend against, but with a prohibition that will follow its elevation to double its present extent, the dissatisfaction and discontent which will ensue in Canada will be serious. Let us see what shape they may assume.

What is known as the "National Policy" has been enforced in Canada by the Tory party for fifteen years. Sir John Macdonald and his government have pursued a course of isolation for Canada, as illustrated in the harsh interpretation of the Fisheries Treaty, the discrimination in the canals, the encouragement of railroad guerrilla warfare, and, above all, the persistence in the highest duties, shutting out American products. Even such articles as were once free are now added to the taxable list, notably such trifles as berries, peaches, and fruit generally, and trees and shrubs, equally with a vast supply of corn and food products from the United States. The result of this policy to the Canadian farmer has not been gratifying, and a great deal of dissatisfaction exists. The Liberal party, on the other hand, with Sir Richard Cartwright as its financial leader, has adopted a policy diametrically opposed to that of the present Canadian government—a policy known as that of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. The exact operation of the application of Sir Richard's policy would be in perfect harmony with that proposed for the South American countries by Mr. Blaine in his recent most important utterances regarding reciprocity. The universal approval on the part of business men and the community generally which Mr. Blaine's proposals have met, so far as South America is concerned, indicates what important results would flow from a similar movement toward reciprocity in the North.

Happily, soon an opportunity will be afforded to test the question whether this is desired or not. A general election in Canada, by the dissolution of Parliament, impends, and on that occasion the people will have it in their power to decide which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

policy shall prevail; whether the policy of isolation, of restriction, and of practical hostility to the United States, as exemplified by the Tory party, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, the policy of unrestricted trade with the United States, as advocated by the Liberal party, resulting in the opening-up of all the resources of the continent to the people of the United States, and of a market for their manufactures the future extent and importance of which no man can tell.

There need be little doubt which side will prevail in this Canadian contest, if only reasonable discernment and common prudence actuate the Congress of the United States at this juncture. The McKinley Bill comes just in time to serve as an object-lesson to the Canadian farmer, and all dependent upon him, of what they will encounter if the Tory government prevails. If he prefers the Tory government, then the prohibition of his exports to the United States under the provisions of that tariff will ensue; and, having deliberately chosen, he may suffer the consequences.

But side by side with the McKinley Bill there is another measure of equal importance before the Congress of the United States—a measure that, so far as Canada is concerned, will make the issue plain whether the people of that country desire a closer relation with the United States or not. The measure referred to is the Butterworth bill providing for unrestricted reciprocity, which is epitomized in a resolution recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, through its astute chairman, the Hon. R. R. Hitt. The latter is only a resolution of ten lines, but rarely, if ever before in the history of legislation, has there been matter of greater import contained in a space so small. For if this resolution should pass, and go to the people of Canada side by side with the McKinley Bill, and the choice of one or the other be the question to be decided, it is impossible to believe that the policy which most favored the people of the United States would not be overwhelmingly adopted. The resolution is in the following words:

"*Resolved*, That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to enter into such commercial arrangements with the United States as will result in the complete removal of all duties upon trade between Canada and the United States, he shall appoint three commissioners, to meet those who may be designated to represent the government of Canada, to consider the best method of extending the trade relations between Canada and the United States, and to ascertain on what terms greater freedom of intercourse between the two countries can best be secured;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress."

The passage of the foregoing resolution by the Congress of the United States would have an important effect, showing that the policy of pressure on Canada was not that which the people of this country desired to enforce. The McKinley Bill alone has that effect; its enforcement, without some mitigating expression, would beget precisely the same consequences that followed the repeal of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, when, amid a burst of loyalty to Great Britain, a determination was reached to be independent of the United States. The national policy succeeded; the Canadian Pacific Railroad was built; the fisheries trouble followed; and all the strain and loss of hostile tariffs, for both sides of the border, have ever since ensued. But the bill of Mr. Butterworth or the resolution of Mr. Hitt, if passed by Congress, would show the real sentiment of the people of the United States—a sentiment which has its expression in the approval of Mr. Blaine's remarkably sagacious plan, viz., a desire for a trade that shall be continental in extent and continental in profit.

The passage of this resolution along with the McKinley Bill would place upon the Canadians the responsibility of their future policy regarding the United States. Fortunately as to time and circumstances, a constitutional means is at hand in the shape of a general parliamentary election to enable them to pronounce that decision, and the result will be a most important indication, so far as the United States is concerned, as to the future policy to be pursued. A verdict in favor of the Liberal party of Canada would be a decision looking to the most intimate relations with this country; to the opening-up of every resource that Canada possesses for American energy, ingenuity, and capital; to an adjustment of all questions that now vex the two peoples; to the creation of a market for the manufactures and merchandise of the United States; and, generally, to advantages quite as great as the creation of a new series of States and territories, in addition to those already existing in the North and Northwest. So that without the drawing of a sword the shedding of a drop of blood, or the expenditure of a single dollar, the area of the trade of the United States could be doubled.

It will be seen in all this that the question of annexation does not arise; neither does the question of a disturbed relation with Great Britain, either on the part of Canada or the United States,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

obtrude itself. The future destiny of Canada may be left to shape itself under circumstances that would favor the most intimate relation with the people of this country. The political connection between the United States and Canada may be a difficult one to achieve at best, and a half-century must elapse before a definite result in that direction could be accomplished. Those who are anxious for an immediate extension of trade and an enlargement of opportunity may well be impatient at the delay which a political union implies, and adopt the sentiment of Horace, that "the short space of life forbids us from laying plans requiring a long time for their accomplishment."

The question as to the loyalty of the Canadian people to the British crown is not at issue in the contest that impends. Were it so, in the present condition of public sentiment, the verdict would most unquestionably be in favor of a maintenance of British connection, even at the risk of tremendous sacrifices; for there is more loyalty in the remotest regions of Canada than there is in the heart of London itself. But while the question of British connection is not involved in the decision as between the national policy of the Tory party in Canada, and the Liberal party's policy of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, nevertheless a very great strain is likely to be put upon the Canadian people in this—that by deciding in favor of reciprocity they decide in favor of the free admission of American manufactures, while they still continue to levy a tax on English goods.

The spectacle would then be presented of one part of the British empire (comprising 40 per cent. of its whole area) discriminating against the products and manufactures of the parent country, while admitting those of a commercial rival free of charge. What Mr. Blaine wants from Cuba and Porto Rico, as dependencies of Spain (as pointed out by Senator Frye), in the free admission of American manufactures, even as against Spain, as the price paid for the free admission of sugar into the United States, Canada under unrestricted reciprocity would be compelled to grant as to all articles of merchandise. The question is a grave one for the people of Canada to answer; but the answer that will come is that the personal interest of her own people should not be sacrificed for the personal interest of the English manufacturer, who has no more interest in the Canadian consumer than in the Fiji Islander, if he will pay spot-cash for his purchases.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The price for free admission of Canadian products into the markets of the United States is the free admission of American goods into the markets of Canada. There is a good deal of loyalty in Canada to British institutions and to Her Majesty, but the loyalty does not extend to the personal and individual interests of English manufacturers, to the sacrifice of those of the Canadian farmer. So far as a discrimination against English goods is concerned, it is no reflection upon English institutions or lack of loyalty to them that would induce a Canadian farmer to prefer prints from Providence, R. I., duty free, at two-thirds the price, to prints from Manchester, England, against which a duty would be levied, and which would therefore be just so much dearer. The individual interest of the various classes of British subjects is the question at issue—not the question of loyalty or disloyalty.

Nevertheless, the point is a delicate one, and the opportunity which would be afforded for its answer by the passage in Congress of the Hitt resolution would be full of the deepest interest to the people of the United States. It is only by the constitutional means of a general election in which the whole people will participate that a question so momentous can be decided—a question that will shape the relations hereafter to exist between the English-speaking people who occupy this continent. Never before in their history did the time and the circumstances seem more opportune for submitting the question as to what these relations should be. If Congress can be prevailed upon to adopt the Butterworth bill or the recommendations of its Committee on Foreign Affairs, the test can be made, and by this peaceful means alone can Canada be captured.

The consequences that will follow the breaking-down of the commercial barrier that now divides this continent into two parts may well be left for the future to unfold. That the attractiveness of republican institutions will more and more impress itself on the Canadian people, there can be no doubt. That close contact with the people of the United States will more and more draw the nation to the north toward what in the end may be a political embrace, many earnestly believe. Whether this comes or not in the future, the present demands that reciprocity of interests should remove all causes of separation, and that Canada should be bound to this country by the closest commercial ties.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRICKLY-PEARS.

BY GRANT ALLEN.

I AM sitting on a great white Algerian rock; in the foreground a tiny mosque with a snowy dome; behind it a tall, green, prickly hedge that masks the huts of a straggling Kabyle village. How strange that here on this arid African hillside an American cactus, the common prickly-pear plant, should grow on the bare and unsmitten rock, to form this hedge, as readily as it grows in its native Mexican desert. It is merely, like myself, a naturalized alien on this side the Atlantic, to be sure; for the cactuses are all true American citizens by birth and training, wholly peculiar to the western hemisphere, where they were first developed, and none of them are found truly indigenous in any part of the old world. But Africa suits the cactus tribe, for all that, down to the very ground; and here on the confines of the burning Sahara itself the prickly-pear basks on the hot soil like a genuine native, to the manner born. It has adopted Algeria. The thrifty colonists introduced it first on their dry hillsides, because it will grow where nothing else can thrive upon the bare rock; and cut up into blocks to disguise its prickles, it forms excellent fodder for the undiscriminating palate of the North African cow. But once introduced, it took care of itself, and now it often spreads a great deal faster than the thrifty colonists aforesaid either wished or imagined.

The cactuses are very peculiar plants—as peculiar structurally as they are bizarre and grotesque in outer appearance. They have spared no pains and shrunk from no sacrifice in accommodating themselves thoroughly to their niche in nature. In the first place, they have no true leaves. What look like leaves in certain jointed cactuses are really flattened and expanded stems. If this seems at first hearing a hard saying, the analogy of the common stone-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

crops, where stem and leaf are hardly distinguishable, will help to make it a little less incredible. In other ways, too, the stone-crops (or sedums, as gardeners call them) throw much light upon the nature of the cactuses. All these rock-haunting or desert plants naturally get very little water, except at long intervals after occasional showers. Hence only those can survive which form themselves, as it were, into living reservoirs to retain all the moisture they once absorb. As soon as the rain falls in their arid haunts, the roots and rootlets eagerly drink it up in a great hurry, and store it away at once in the soft and spongy cellular tissue of which the main part of the plant is wholly formed. For this purpose, both in stone-crops and cactuses, the stems have become fleshy and succulent, and, being also green and leaf-like, they closely resemble true leaves. But they are covered externally with a thick skin, which resists evaporation and keeps the moisture, once collected, at the plant's disposal for an unlimited period. In short, the cactus does as a plant just what the camel does as an animal.

It is obvious that plants thus situated would dry up and shrivel under the sun's heat in a very short time if they had thin leaves of the ordinary type, provided with numerous pores and open spiracles. Hence it almost always happens that sandy or desert species have thick, succulent stems, as we see not only in the stone-crops and house-leeks, but also in the glassworts and other fleshy plants so commonly found on dry sea beaches. And so necessary is this result that in the deserts of India, where true cactuses are quite unknown, several kinds of spurges have assumed precisely the same outer shape, and, having got rid of their true leaves, have developed jointed succulent stems exactly mimicking those of the genuine cactus. Old Anglo-Indians know them by that name alone, and pooh-pooh science when it tries to tell them their cactuses are only euphorbias in disguise.

In both cases, however, the leaves, though greatly reduced, have not entirely or irretrievably disappeared. They, or their representatives, still survive in the prickly spines with which the joints of the cactus are so plentifully sprinkled. In order to understand this further transformation, we have only to think first of the needs of the cactus plant, and then of the analogies of the stone-crops and house-leeks. Desert vegetation is exposed to exceptional and peculiar dangers. Just in proportion as there is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

little in the way of greenstuff about to eat does the hungry herbivore greatly desire to eat it. Hence only those plants were likely to survive in the struggle for existence which rendered themselves peculiarly unpleasant to the assaulting enemy. In the cactus the leaves have, accordingly, assumed the form of sharp prickles, which in the particular species that bears the prickly-pear are arranged on the leaf-like stem in a regular quincunx or five-starred pattern. How so strange a transformation comes about is readily shown in the house-leeks and echeverias of our garden bowers, in which each leaf of the rosette ends in a sharp thorn; or, still better, in the glassworts of the seaside, which seems like stone-crops whose fleshy leaves have converted themselves by sharpening into regular prickles.

But as the cactuses have got rid of leaves, the stem has to do the work of the foliage. For this purpose it has become green and leaf-like, and it performs all the common foliar functions—that is to say, it eats for the plant, absorbing carbon from the floating carbonic acid of the air, and assimilating it in its tissues with the aid of sunlight. Thus the young and tender stems are quite leaf-like; but as they grow old they gradually assume the appearance of a trunk, partially lose their jointed look, and acquire bark of a hard, dry, brown, and tree-like character.

Cactuses have a wonderful knack of reproducing themselves under the most adverse conditions. If you take a cutlass and hack a cactus plant into little bits (as I have often seen a negro do in Jamaica to clear the soil), each tiny fragment that falls upon the ground will grow in time into a separate cactus bush. At first sight this seems a very marvellous and exceptional power, for sometimes the new plant grows from a most insignificant and unnoticeable scrap of the parent stem; and, indeed, in North Africa the regular way of planting a prickly-pear hedge is to chop an old cactus into tiny bits, and then lay them along in a shallow trench just traced to receive them, where they straightway grow into big bristly fences. But when one comes to look a little closer at the matter, the apparent anomaly disappears at once. For, in fact, what one plants is a cutting from the stem, and there is nothing more remarkable in such a cutting taking root and thriving than in slips from a rosebush or an apple-tree growing when stuck in the ground. The fact is, every part of every plant has in it the inherent power of reproducing an entire

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

organism, as a crystal reproduces itself in a proper solution. Sometimes even a bit of a leaf will do, as everybody who has cultivated a rock garden must have noticed in the case of sedums, mere scraps of which often root and grow wherever they happen to fall by accident. Again, in a potato, we similarly cut out a piece of the tuber with an eye—that is to say, an undeveloped bud—in it, and are not at all surprised that it grows at once into a new potato-vine. Even seeds and bulbils (like those of the tiger-lily) are, in essence, merely specialized buds that fall from the mother-plant so as to start in life on their own account elsewhere.

All that is peculiar to the cactus, then, is this: that, being a dry desert creature, it is necessarily endowed with great vitality; and portions of it will accordingly root and thrive under circumstances where any less hardy species would dry up and wither for want of moisture.

It will now, I suppose, be quite obvious to everybody why the cactus flower seems to grow out of the end of a leaf—a peculiarity specially noticeable in the pretty pink and purple epiphyllums so commonly cultivated in small conservatories. In reality, it grows exactly where one would expect it—at the end of a stem; only the stem has been flattened out so much as to deceive the eye by looking thoroughly leaf-like. In the prickly-pear the flowers are pale yellow, and, though large, can hardly be considered handsome. They grow quite flat on the edge of the seeming leaves, in a squat and somewhat undignified attitude. So far as I have observed (but my opportunities for watching them have not been great), they appear to be mainly fertilized by various night-flying moths with a long proboscis, which come out at dusk; and for this reason, like so many other night-fertilized flowers, they are pale yellow. The well-known and lovely night-flowering cereus, a sister-cactus, which is still more thoroughly nocturnal in its ways (so much so that it lasts but for a single evening), is pure white, to catch the eyes of the moths in the tropical moonlight, and it further attracts them by its strong and almost overpowering perfume, which closely resembles that of tuberose, stephanotis, jasmine, and many other white night-blooming flowers. In the prickly-pear, however, the scent is very faint, and is only perceptible to any extent in the gray of the evening. The moths visit it, of course, for the sake of honey, and, thrusting their proboscis into its tubular depths, unconsciously carry the fertilizing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pollen from flower to flower, as they flit from one plant to another in succession.

The fruit itself—the prickly-pear so familiar in all European and American markets—follows in due course from the fertilized blossom. It is a clumsy reddish and yellowish thing, covered, like the plant itself, with those bunches of sharp hairs which have gained it its common English name. The hairs are there, no doubt, to deter unauthorized and useless intruders; the skin protects it from insect foes and small birds; the pulp allures the monkeys, toucans, and other proper dispensers of the seed or kernel; and the grains dispersed through its fleshy part are either thrown away by the animal, or, if swallowed, are not digested, owing to their tough and stony covering. We thus see in this singular cactus a most perfect adaptation in every part to the circumstances of the arid and rocky soil on which it springs. So perfect is the adaptation, indeed, that the prickly-pear has long since travelled to every similar country of the civilized or semi-civilized world, and is now almost as common in the Barbary States and on the Mediterranean shore as on its own native Mexican deserts. It is easy enough to make it grow: the real difficulty, as the small cultivators of the Riviera are beginning to find out, is, once it gets in, ever to get rid of it.

GRANT ALLEN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REPLY TO X. M. C.

BY THE HON. THOMAS B. REED, SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

IT IS really a great pity that the article entitled "Speaker Reed's Error" should not have received the illumination of the author's name. It is very true that an argument ought to be just as good whether written by one man or another, but if the real name of the writer in this case had been signed to the article, every reader would have made the comparison between the immense resources of the author and the very small results of the argument, and would instantly have said: "If he who knows so much can say so little, how weak his side must be."

Those familiar with the discussion will see that, notwithstanding twenty-two pages are taken up in the attempt to answer eight, not a solitary new fact or principle is brought into the field. Except the comparison of the Speaker with *Dogberry*, there is really nothing new.

All the arguments, or assertions rather, which he has presented about the presidential veto and the submission of amendments to the Constitution, were presented in the House of Representatives and will be found in the House debates, where the ideas were so thoroughly exploded that Mr. Carlisle did not deem them worth producing in his able and candid article. But the anonymous parliamentarian, never having either heard or read the debates, was perhaps not to blame for not knowing the failure of those arguments when brought to the light of day. In seclusion they may have seemed good, but in the House of Representatives they survived, even in the estimation of their best friends, only the brief measure of time which was required to state them.

It is not the intention of this article to restate the arguments in favor of the position of the House of Representatives on the quorum question, which is now acquiesced in by the people of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States. That would be entirely superfluous. If they were not stated in the March article, then they cannot be stated by me. It is worth while, however, to restate the principle involved—a principle which has not been limited in its acceptance by the assent of Governor David B. Hill and of such bodies as town councils, gas companies, and the like, but has had the concurrence of supreme courts all over the country. When the Supreme Court of the State of Maine, the Supreme Court of New Hampshire, the Supreme Court of Indiana, and the Supreme Court of Illinois, and many others, have solemnly and repeatedly decided that the doctrine of the quorum as maintained by the present House of Representatives is the law everywhere, their decisions are not to be controverted by a sneer about town councils and gas companies. When all the courts are on the side of David B. Hill, it is hard for even so exalted a person as an ex-M. C. to put him down with a phrase or dispose of him as a mere politician.

The principle which all the courts have thus unanimously sustained is a very simple one, and solves all the problems with equal advantage to the business of the country and equal solace to its common-sense.

The presence of a majority of the legislative body constitutes a quorum to do business. The essence of all business on the part of the legislative body is the consent of a majority of a quorum of that body, either express or implied. It may be as thoroughly expressed by silence as by sound. In the parliamentary sense, presence always implies full sight and hearing of all that takes place. If a member, then, is present in full sight and sound of all occurrences, and if all action is loudly proclaimed by clerk or Speaker, he is as much a party consenting to all that occurs as if he vociferated in his loudest tones. This all admit. Even the writer of the anonymous article admits this in all cases except that of a yea-and-nay vote. Hence, even with him, we have only to deal with that method of determining the result.

It must be obvious that all methods of determining the consent of the members are of equal value. By each of them laws are passed which have equal validity. Whether the sense of the House is made manifest by mere volume of sound or by the rising of members in their places, by members passing between tellers or by yeas and nays, makes no difference whatever in the result. Laws passed either way have equal force. What, then, was the ob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ject of the constitutional provision as to yeas and nays? Was it to establish a new and separate doctrine of quorum? Was the quorum to be a majority present when all other methods of determining the question were used, but a majority voting when yeas and nays were called? Was there to be one quorum required in one case and another quorum in another? Does it require any different body to pass a bill by yeas and nays than by a rising vote? A majority of the House being present, can 129 members to 1 pass a bill by standing up, and not pass it by yeas and nays? A claim like this utterly ignores the meaning of the call for yeas and nays, and the right to have it which is given under the Constitution. What were the yeas and nays given for? Look at the debates on the adoption of the Constitution and you will see. It was to inform the people how their representatives voted, if they voted at all; and also the fact that they did not vote, if such was the case. The idea that, in addition to this, the constitutional quorum was thereby instantly shifted from a majority present to a majority acting is entirely a modern invention, as illogical as it is unconstitutional.

The clerk's count of those who are present and do not vote seems to meet the disapproval of the anonymous writer. "Gathering up hastily the names of those scattered around the House" is one of the phrases. "Sees, or thinks he sees" is another. This is entirely gratuitous. How long since has sight been inferior to sound? When was it determined that the eye was less accurate than the ear?

In actual practice how is it? The clerk's record as to men present has thrice been corrected as to those present and not voting, one name each time; but this has never been so as to affect results. Many more times than that has there been error as to those who voted. People have responded by mistake for men at home sick, and men of similar name have responded. At one session of the Forty-fourth Congress, December 4, 1876, an error was made on the vote which changed the result entirely. A motion to suspend the rules was carried by a vote of 136 to 78. Mr. Plaisted, of Maine, was recorded as not voting. On the 5th of December, the next day, he rose in his place and declared that he voted in the negative, and proved it. Afterward Mr. Fuller arose and declared that, although he was recorded as not voting, he had voted in the affirmative. This left the vote

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

137 to 79, not two-thirds. Thereupon Mr. Randall, the Speaker, claimed the right to give the casting vote and gave it, and so the motion was finally carried. On January 8, 1849, Mr. Farrelly's vote was not recorded, and on the next day the correction was made and the result changed. The motion was lost instead of carried. The vote by yeas and nays whereby General Grant was made General on the retired list, as given in the House journal, contains no less than four errors, which can never be corrected, the Congress having ceased to be.

Examples might easily be multiplied to show that this "absolute correctness of the vote" is but the dream of an ingenious pamphleteer hard-pressed for an argument, and despairing at the outset of finding any to which he would care to sign his name.

In the face and eyes of these facts how idle it is to say, "The call insures the absolute correctness of the vote." With the very same truth it may be said that the roll-call and the noting of members present and not voting insure the record of the presence of a quorum with accuracy. It is not absolute correctness in either case, but as much so in the one as the other.

It is hardly worth while to waste time on the discrepancy discovered between Rule VIII. and Rule XV.; between a rule of imperfect obligation, which expresses the sense of the House as to the duty of each member, and a rule which meets the practical question of a member refusing to do his duty. If the actual bodily presence of a majority of members constitutes a quorum, as all the courts have unanimously decided, is anything more needed than the machinery to record that fact? Does recording the fact that they refuse to do their duty exonerate them? Has the anonymous writer forgotten the oft-quoted quotation of the most eminent Speaker that ever sat in the chair apropos of Rule VIII., that "you might bring a horse to water, but could not make him drink"? Does this nameless writer dream that he could do what the unrivalled resources and wonderful genius of Mr. Blaine were openly confessed to be unequal to? Is there somewhere in space a mute, inglorious Milton, some buried Cromwell, who could have done what our most skilful parliamentarian declared in open House he could not?

The evil to be corrected by the new rules is admitted by the ex-M. C. He therefore proposes a much better remedy, as he thinks. At the outset it should be borne in mind that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

remedy in use has done its work. The House of Representatives, by its capable and sensible transaction of business, has attracted the approval of the whole country. The unknown writer says that this should all be set aside and his remedy adopted, and the shades of many eminent persons, dead and living, thereby be placated. Did it ever occur to the reader what a singular dispensation of Providence it is whereby those who do not have the things of this world to do could have always done them so much better than the poor creatures who did do them? Did you ever see a sidewalk committee who could not build a finer house than the architect and the master-workman? It really looks as if Providence had wasted its most cloying sweetness on the desert air. The new rule which the critic suggests is that the Speaker should fine each member who refuses to vote "not exceeding fifty dollars," and thereby compel the horse to drink. This seems very strange, coming as it does from a writer who has so deep a respect for the letter of the law that, when the Constitution says the votes of both houses shall be determined by the "yeas and nays," he will be satisfied with no construction which shall not determine the quorum the same way.

Suppose we apply the same strictness of construction to this new rule. "Each house," says the Constitution, "may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its members for disorderly behavior, and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member." You will notice that the power to determine the rules of its proceedings is separate from its power to punish its members for disorderly conduct. The Constitution does not say that the House may determine the rules of its proceedings and rules for the punishment of members for disorderly conduct. Not at all. "The House," says the Constitution, "may determine its rules and may punish its members." It is the House in both cases.

Would the writer whose name is so well concealed contend that the House could delegate to the Speaker the right to determine the rules of its proceedings? Of course not! How, then, can the House delegate to the Speaker its power to punish its members for disorderly conduct? It could just as legally by two-thirds vote make a rule which would authorize the Speaker to expel a member.

Here is a clause which contains three propositions: (1) The House may determine the rules of its proceedings; (2) punish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its members for disorderly behavior; and (3), with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a member.

The Constitution says that the House may do all these things. Nobody would ever dream of saying that the House could delegate to the Speaker its right to act under the first clause or the last. Who until now ever supposed that the power in the second clause could be turned over to another? Who before this writer ever seriously proposed that the House could delegate its power to punish? The very interposition of the words "with the concurrence of two-thirds" shows conclusively that the House is to do the act.

For the purpose of giving a false force to his argument, the author, with injurious generosity, gives the present Speaker omnipotent power over the rules. But if the present Speaker, or any Speaker, had even hinted at a desire to have the power to fine members "not exceeding fifty dollars," he would have seen the limit of his power. In short, the scheme is both unconstitutional and impracticable. The House could not do it if it would and would not if it could.

It is surprising to see the sudden transformation of the author from strictness to looseness of constitutional construction when he passes from something some one else has done to the thing he wants to do. Delegate the power to punish to the Speaker? You can see the position in which this writer was placed, and which forced him to this remarkable proposition.

Here was a gigantic evil—so vast that the people, without distinction of party, on second sober thought approved of its suppression, even when done as some of them claimed in a partisan way. If the remedy used was to be condemned, it was needful to suggest some other remedy. It would not do to appeal to the power of the House, pure and simple, to punish by fine its disorderly members, for the reply to that was very obvious. It took six hours of hard work under rules which counted a quorum to censure one member. To discipline 130 members would have produced all the effects of the most elaborate filibustering. It would have taken three months—not to say eternity. Obviously, then, in order to make a plausible case, the power of the House to punish and expel must be treated with a latitudinarian system of construction which could not be tolerated unless carefully disguised. Hence the jumbling together of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

two distinct powers of the House, kept entirely separate in the Constitution—the power to determine the rules of its proceedings and that other entirely different provision, the power to punish members for disorderly conduct. Both powers belong to the House, and can be delegated to no man.

If any parliamentary body has ever undertaken to allow its presiding officer to fine its members without appeal, its name has not yet been brought into prominence. "At some future day, perhaps, Mr. —— will deem it wise—nay, deem it necessary—to show a single shred of authoritative parliamentary ruling to justify a "—proposition—"so extraordinary!"

The author says the President's veto cannot be overruled except by a quorum actually voting. Why? Because, he says, "the votes of both houses shall be determined by yeas and nays." Yeas and nays must certainly show each vote of each member. Each member's vote must be determined by yeas and nays. But there is no applicability of this provision to that entirely different question whether either house is in condition for doing business by having a quorum present. What the House votes is one thing; what it is is another. The Constitution prescribes how the vote shall be determined; the rules made under the Constitution prescribe how the presence of a quorum shall be determined. Whatever business is done is done by a competent body; and if that body, properly constituted, acquiesces in the result arrived at by its members who do vote, what shock is there either to common-sense, business sense, or constitutional law?

The Supreme Court of Maine has decided that three aldermen out of seven, a plain minority, were not only enough to certify the election of members of the Legislature, but to create a presumption of a quorum actually present when there was no other record. The Supreme Court of New Hampshire has decided that when, of seven aldermen, six were present and three voted, the votes of two were enough to carry the measure.

To be sure these are citations about aldermen and other inferior persons, but our author's contempt for aldermen and town councilmen ought not to blind him to the fact that the decisions were by the supreme courts of two States, and supreme courts of such well-known learning that they ought not to be confounded with the inferior persons whose cases they decided. It must always be borne in mind that the law in this country

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

applies with equal measure to all persons, both great and small. The law which governs the doctrine of a quorum in a town council governs it also in Congress, if the constituting provision be the same. The converse also follows, that whatever law governs a quorum in Congress governs the quorum in the hundred thousand school boards and councils everywhere in the land. Not the least of the good effects of the proclamation of the true doctrine by the House is the advantage it has been and will be to those corporate bodies, through which flows the blood which gives health and vigor to the whole body politic.

The action of the Senate of the Empire State of New York, acquiesced in by all parties ever since, is not to be lightly dismissed as the partisan action of David B. Hill. Nobody has ever dared to question the law passed under that ruling, and nobody has since questioned the ruling itself. Other sovereign States are certainly entitled to some respect.

It may be that the House of Representatives at Washington ought to have set a good example to all the States. But how if it did not? Must progress be stopped and common-sense flouted because they did not begin at the top? Was wisdom to be rejected because it was not found under the biggest wigs?

It has not been thought worth while in this article to notice the citations from eminent authors, as they have not the slightest bearing upon the questions at issue. They do not touch upon them in the least. They can only impress the uncritical and careless with the idea that the author had the support of famous names. There is no need to produce Judge Cooley, *The Federalist*, Erskine May, and Judge Story to prove that the House can punish its members for disorderly behavior, when the Constitution expressly says so in seven words. Do these plain words need buttressing by even those eminent names?

This quoting of abundant authorities is a good old device of [illegible] attorneys: when your case is weak anywhere, double the witnesses on the parts where there is little or no dispute. It is a good way to confuse the jury and keep out of mind the point against you. Forcing men to vote by fines would be utterly ineffectual in case of a revolt such as we had early in this session, if the House alone exercised its power to punish. Therefore the author, in a parenthesis, slides in a proposition for the Speaker to punish, then proceeds to buttress, by numerous citations, the right

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the House, and thinks the jury will suppose that the right of the House and the right of the Speaker are one and the same thing. His scheme is worthless unless the House can delegate its power to the Speaker, and that is the very point which his citations do not touch. On the point of the right of the House they are as abundant as they are superfluous. The very case which he cites in a foot-note of the action of Mr. Colfax was a case of punishment by the House, not by the Speaker. Suppose I should now turn to the anonymous writer and quote to him his own language: "You propose a new rule, giving the Speaker at his own discretion, in a certain case, power to punish a member by fines; yet not one in the entire number of Speakers, eminent, dead, buried, and alive, ever suggested that the Constitution contained the strange power that you are trying to induce the House to insert among its rules, where it never had place before." Would not the author be overwhelmed? and if not, why not?

If it be a good argument against counting a quorum that no distinguished man ever did it, why is it not a good argument against making the Speaker a police justice that no distinguished man—at least no distinguished man over his own name—had ever hinted at it? If it be a good rejoinder to this to say that the evil has only existed during the last two years, why is it not equally so to the declaration that Rule XV. cannot be sustained because it has just been invented? If novelty be no objection to the one, why is it to the other?

The most surprising sentence in the whole article is the last one. "May we not believe that he [Speaker Reed] is strong enough and wise enough and brave enough to retrace his steps and correct his error?" Retrace *his* steps and correct *his* error! What little comprehension this writer would have us think he possesses of what has actually occurred!

The "error" whereof he treats was the error of the Speaker just twenty-six hours. Then it became the error of the House of Representatives. It has since become the error of the Republican party and of the people of the United States. It had previously been the "error" of the State supreme courts.

Whatever may be the strength, wisdom, or bravery of the Speaker, he has never thought himself strong enough, wise enough, or brave enough to correct an "error" of that kind and of those dimensions.

THOMAS B. REED.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SPEAKER AND HIS CRITICS.

BY A DEMOCRATIC LEADER.

THE filibustering tactics by which, in recent years, the minorities of legislative bodies have sought to prevent the majorities from exercising control over parliamentary business have awakened in many minds serious doubts as to the future of parliamentary governments. Government by party is an almost essential feature of representative institutions. The party which is in the minority to-day will be in the majority to-morrow. Success carries with it the seeds of disaster. Sooner or later every party majority becomes unpopular, and dissatisfaction is inevitably followed by defeat. If parliamentary obstruction be permissible or defensible, government by majorities is necessarily impossible. Few, indeed, have ever disputed the cardinal principle that a majority is entitled to the absolute control of legislative business; yet when obstructive tactics are practised day by day, every attempt of the majority to protect its own powers is usually assailed and vehemently condemned as an invasion of the rights of the minority.

A rule recently adopted by the House of Representatives to prevent a very common method of obstruction has, however, evoked an extraordinary degree of criticism. This rule has generally been attributed to the Speaker of the present House, and it has been made the subject of a very ingenious criticism by a member of his own party whose identity remains concealed.

In dealing with parliamentary obstructions it has always been exceedingly difficult to devise rules which would operate to suppress the practice without invading in some degree those privileges of individual members which have heretofore been jealously guarded by all parliamentary bodies. The particular rule, however, which has provoked such severe animadversion from the distinguished Republican who signs himself "X. M. C." must inevitably appear to an impartial mind to be less objectionable than

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many rules which have gone into practice almost without a protest. Briefly stated, Rule XV. permits a quorum to be counted when a quorum is actually present, notwithstanding the refusal of any number of members to answer the roll-call.

In assailing the rule, its critics have taken the ground that the House is without a quorum when a majority fail to answer the roll-call, although ninety-nine-one-hundredths of all the members may be actually sitting in their seats. This proposition is supported with great ingenuity by X. M. C., but a careful examination of his argument serves only to illustrate the fallacy of his position.

It is hardly necessary to waste time in a discussion of the proposition that Rule XV. is in absolute and irreconcilable contradiction to Rule VIII. The entire argument of X. M. C. on this subject shows more humor than honesty, more wit than wisdom. Placing the two rules in juxtaposition, it is difficult to see how they are in the slightest degree irreconcilable with each other. Rule VIII. provides that it is the duty of every member to be present in the House during the sittings, and to vote upon every question unless excused. Rule XV. simply provides that, if a member prove contumacious and disregard the provision of Rule VIII., his disobedience shall not affect the power of the House to transact its business. "Was the Eighth rule," asks X. M. C., "inserted in the code of the House to remain unenforced, while Speaker Reed, in a spirit of plenary indulgence, invented the Fifteenth rule for the ease and convenience of members? . . . One cannot be enforced without destroying the other."

In what sense are they absolutely irreconcilable? It is none the less the duty of every member to vote because, if he fails to do so, his presence in the House shall be noted and he himself counted as one of the quorum. It is true that no penalty is provided for a violation of Rule VIII., but to violate it is none the less a transgression of the duty of a member. Disorderly conduct in the House is usually punished by the censure of the House, pronounced by the Speaker on the offending member. Would X. M. C. claim that the censuring of a member who offends the dignity of the House relieves him of all obligation to maintain a decorous and orderly demeanor? Would he contend that no member need behave himself because, by accept-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing the censure of the Speaker, he might be as disorderly as he pleased?

In point of fact, the two rules are entirely consistent with each other. Rule XV. is the complement of Rule VIII. The last-mentioned rule prescribes the duty of the member; the first-mentioned rule provides for the protection of the House from the consequences which would otherwise flow from what X. M. C. justly describes as the disorderly conduct of a minority.

The fundamental error into which X. M. C. and the other critics of Rule XV. have fallen is the assumption that a quorum of the House can be ascertained only by calling the yeas and nays. It is difficult to understand on what this proposition is based. We cannot find anything in the Constitution which in express terms justifies it. In the English House of Commons, from which our parliamentary system is derived, the existence of a quorum is determined by an actual count of the members present. The Federal Constitution provides that a majority of the members present shall constitute a quorum, and that no business can be done unless a quorum be present.

According to X. M. C., this provision means not only that a quorum must be present, but that sufficient members to constitute a quorum must actually respond to their names on a call of the roll. There being no specific warrant for this assertion in the Constitution, he seeks to prove that it is the inevitable conclusion to be drawn from other constitutional provisions. He quotes Section 7 of Article I. of the Constitution, which provides for the passage of a bill over the veto of the President by a vote of two-thirds of the members of each House, and he lays special stress upon the clause which requires that in all such cases the votes of both houses shall be determined by the yeas and nays.

If the framers of the Constitution intended that the presence of a quorum should be determined by the yeas and nays, it is difficult to conceive any reason why they should not have expressed their intention in words and inserted them in the Constitution itself.

There is a perfectly valid reason for requiring that the votes of the two houses shall be determined by the yeas and nays when the passage of a bill over the veto of the President is involved, which appears to have been overlooked by X. M. C.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The right to pass a bill over the veto of the Executive was an innovation in parliamentary government. When our Constitution was framed, the veto of the king was an absolute bar to legislation, and although no British monarch for a century had assumed to forbid the enactment of any law which had passed both houses of Parliament, in theory at least the assent of the sovereign was still essential to the validity of every act of Parliament. When, therefore, the authors of our organic law undertook to subject the veto power of the President to the control of Congress, it was perfectly natural that they should provide that the assertion of the supremacy of the legislative over the executive department should be attended by certain solemnities which might be dispensed with in the ordinary exercise of legislative functions. X. M. C., however, claims that the constitutional provision which requires that the votes of both houses shall be determined by the yeas and nays when the veto of the President is under consideration, carries with it by implication a constitutional mandate that the number of members present in the House shall be determined by the same method.

On this subject his argument is so original and interesting that it is impossible to paraphrase or condense it without doing injustice to the humor and ingenuity of the author. It is therefore given in full.

"Let us suppose that a bill (Senate Bill No. 1129, for example) is vetoed by the President. It is returned to the Senate, and, coming up for reconsideration, is passed over the veto by a vote of 50 yeas to 24 nays. Two-thirds have thus voted in the affirmative, and the total vote (74) is undoubtedly a quorum of the Senate. The bill goes to the House, and the House votes 90 in the affirmative and 40 in the negative. Two-thirds of those voting have thus voted to override the veto, but the total vote is only 130—36 short of a quorum and but 20 more than one-third of the House. It is precisely the same aggregate vote on which Speaker Reed declared that the bill to 'admit Idaho as a State in the Union' had been duly passed. He did this on the declaration that the number of members present and '*not voting*' added to those '*voting*' made up a quorum of the House. Would Speaker Reed on the same principle declare that the two-thirds vote of 90 to 40 had passed the bill over the President's veto?

"The Constitution says that in passing a bill over a veto the votes of both houses 'shall be determined by yeas and nays.' If 'determined by yeas and nays,' how can Speaker Reed count a class of members who voted neither yea nor nay? The vote given by yeas and nays lacks 36 of a quorum. Under what rule can the Speaker add 36 who did not vote to the 130 who did vote? On which side will he count them? He cannot know how they would vote. If he divides them evenly between the two sides, it will give 18 to each, and the vote will then stand 108 to 58. That changes the result, because it does not show a two-thirds vote in the affirmative. Observe, further, that the clause in the Constitution says, 'if *two-thirds* of the house [to which the bill is returned] *shall agree* to pass the bill, it shall be sent to the other house, and if *approved by two-thirds* of that house, it shall become a law.' Two-thirds of 'that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

house' must be two-thirds of a quorum. It is not a house until a quorum is acting. When Speaker Reed shall have recorded the 36 members, would he declare the 90 votes as the *approval* of *two-thirds* of the whole quorum of 166, as made up under his famous Rule XV.?

"It would be interesting, when the Constitution declares that the 'votes' shall be determined by '*yeas* and *nays*,' to hear how the Speaker can 'determine' the votes by any other process. In all other cases, it will be observed that the *yeas* and *nays* can only be called on demand of at least one-fifth of the members present, but in the case of overriding a veto of the President, the Constitution itself directs the calling and recording of the *yeas* and *nays*. The purpose of this specific direction is to guard against all doubt in 'determining' the result of the vote, for it is not only the interest of every one to have a correct result, but it is the special right of the President to know with exactness the vote by which a bill is passed over his veto and made a law against his consent.

"How would Speaker Reed communicate to the President the supposed result of 90 yeas to 40 nays, when a quorum is 166? It would seem very lame and awkward for the Speaker to state the simple facts of the case. He would be compelled to frame his communication somewhat as follows:

"'FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, ——, 1890.

"'TO THE PRESIDENT:

"'In the vote of the House to determine whether "Senate Bill No. 1129" should pass against your objections, the *yeas* were 90 and the *nays* were 40—more than two-thirds in the affirmative. You will observe that the total vote falls short of a quorum, but under Rule XV. the Clerk of the House has entered on the Journal the names of 36 members who were present in the hall at the time the *yeas* and *nays* were called, *but declined to vote*. Under Rule XV., however, they are permitted to maintain silence and are held to form part of the quorum, just as if they had voted. No one can tell what their votes would have been if they had obeyed Rule VIII., which commands that "every member present within the hall of the House during its sitting shall vote upon each question put." The enclosed extract from the Journal will give you the names of the voting and of the non-voting members of the quorum. Of course the number of names recorded as voting does not answer the Constitutional requirement to override your veto, but you are probably aware of my decision that "attendance alone is necessary."

"'Your obedient servant,
"'THOMAS B. REED, Speaker.'"

This letter is a striking illustration of extravagance in criticism. The entire argument of X. M. C. on this branch of the subject has been inserted in this article, as it forms the strongest and most trenchant criticism of the possible operation of Rule XV. in an extreme case. It is, however, obvious that the criticism overshoots itself. The very letter which he satirically assumes the Speaker would send to the Executive would, if sent, constitute a forcible statement that in the case assumed by X. M. C. the House had refused to pass the bill over the President's veto. If the number of members present actually amounted to 166, and 90 voted to override the veto, two things are absolutely plain: first, that a quorum was present; and, secondly, that two-thirds of the House—that is to say, of the quorum—did not agree to pass the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President. When we speak of the House, we mean the quorum, as X. M. C. very clearly points out. If, therefore, two-thirds of the quorum—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that is to say, two-thirds of the 166 members ascertained to be present—had not concurred in the passage of the bill, the veto could not have been overridden. The presence of the quorum having been ascertained, and only ninety votes having been cast for the bill, it would follow inevitably that two-thirds of the House had refused to agree to the measure, and the letter of the Speaker would be an unmistakable announcement of that fact.

Again, X. M. C. strenuously insists that Speaker Reed's method of determining a quorum is obviously inapplicable to every legislative proceeding where the concurrence of two-thirds of the members of either house is made essential by the Constitution. But if it be once conceded that the presence of a quorum can be ascertained by any other method than by the calling of the roll, his entire argument must necessarily fall to the ground. In discussing the constitutional provision that two-thirds of both houses, whenever they deem it necessary, may propose amendments to the Constitution, X. M. C. insists that it is as imperative that two-thirds of a quorum should actually vote as that the number of States ratifying shall be three-fourths of the States in the Union; and his proposition is absolutely undeniable. He differs from Speaker Reed only in the method by which the presence of a quorum may be ascertained. When, however, he asserts that, if only four States voted on the proposition, Speaker Reed would, if he adhered to his logic, be compelled to declare the amendment carried, his argument sinks to the level of childishness. The term "quorum" can only be applied to an assemblage composed of many members acting as a single body. A State acts in its sovereign and separate capacity. To claim that any rule governing the proceedings of a deliberative body could apply to the separate action of distinct, sovereign, and independent States, is so absurd that it only serves to illustrate the facility with which a ready but unbridled wit may degenerate into extravagance.

If, he asks again, the roll-call disclosed that but one member voted in the affirmative, while 165 members were present, remaining silent in their seats, would the bill be declared a law? But in answering Speaker Reed's argument that many bills have been passed in Congress where but one or two votes have been cast in favor of them, X. M. C. argues, with irresistible logic, that the presence of a quorum is always presumed during a session, because

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

every member has it in his power at any time to demand a count of the House. If, however, a quorum may be present by presumption when, as a matter of fact, less than 100 members, and even less than 20 members, are in the House, surely the assent of 165 members present, though not voting, to the passage of the bill, may be presumed from their silence. If the physical presence of a quorum may be presumed with such effect as to give validity to a law passed by a House actually consisting of 20 members, it may with equal propriety be presumed that 165 members, sitting silent in their seats with power to defeat the bill by merely recording their votes, were content to see it passed. X. M. C. invokes the doctrine of presumptions when it strengthens his argument: he will undoubtedly be willing to permit his adversary to avail himself of a presumption less violent than the one to which he has himself appealed.

Passing, then, from the practical application of the rule, which, as we have seen, would produce none of the absurd results which X. M. C. has chosen to attribute to it, let us consider the constitutional aspect of the question.

The Constitution in terms empowers the House to compel the attendance of its members. Speaker Reed interprets this provision to mean that the House may compel the attendance of its members and count them after their attendance is secured. X. M. C. concedes that the House may compel the attendance of its members, but insists that no member can be counted as present except by his own consent.

It is plain that under the contention of X. M. C. the power to compel the attendance of members falls short of equipping the House with power to do its business. True, he suggests what he deems to be a remedy, and this suggestion we will presently consider; but it is certain that prior to the ruling of Speaker Reed the constitutional provision that the House shall have the power to compel the attendance of its members did not suffice to give it power to obtain a quorum.

It has not infrequently occurred in the past, after a call of the House had been ordered, that a call of the roll would disclose the presence of a large majority of members. Proceedings under the roll-call having been dispensed with, and the business of the House having been taken up, it would be found on the very first call that less than a quorum responded to their names. Another

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

call would thereupon be ordered, when a majority of the members would appear to be present, but on the resumption of regular business, the absence of a quorum would again be disclosed. To compel the attendance of members under such circumstances became merely an act of cruelty to the diligent members of the House. It simply resulted in imposing upon the already overburdened atmosphere of the chamber the support of several additional, and, in a legislative sense, useless, pairs of lungs.

When the Constitution empowered the House to compel the attendance of its members, it is fair to assume that the framers of that instrument believed that they had equipped the parliamentary body with power at all times to secure and maintain a quorum. As a matter of fact, however, a quorum previous to the assembling of the Fifty-first Congress could be secured only by the consent of the members. The breaking of a quorum became a regular feature of the filibustering process. It was a weapon so potent in the hands of the minority that it never failed to force the majority into a compromise involving a surrender, to some extent, of the principle in contending for which they had provoked the opposition of the minority.

X. M. C. discourses wisely and learnedly on the importance of a yea-and-nay vote in properly recording the proceedings of the House, and he argues with great force that the general policy of our constitutional system is to require every member to bear his proportion of the burden of legislation and assume his share of its responsibilities. These propositions no man can dispute. But when any considerable number of members, by refusing to obey the rules which require them to vote, can be held to deprive the House of the power to enact any bill to which they may be opposed, X. M. C. would give to their silence an importance which the Constitution denies to their votes. In other words, he would put a premium on disorder and disobedience. To state that, when the attendance of a member is compelled by the process of the House, that member, by a mere refusal to vote, can suspend all legislative proceedings, is to state that the Constitution equipped both houses of Congress with a power that could only be used for oppression, but which could never be made effective for the transaction of the public business.

It is quite true that for one hundred years the presence of a quorum has been determined by the calling of the yeas and nays.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is equally true that in a House composed of members obedient to the rules it is the simplest and most effective method of ascertaining the number present. But where any portion of the House refuse to be recorded, it is perfectly plain that a mere calling of the roll does not establish the actual number of persons within the walls of the House. If for one hundred years the presence of a quorum had always been ascertained by a roll-call, that fact merely shows that for one hundred years the rules of the House had not been used for the purpose of carrying obstruction to such an extent as to practically place the entire operation of the legislative department of the government at the mercy of a small minority.

X. M. C. himself admits that there must be some means by which the House can provide a quorum to do business, even in the sense in which he understands the word quorum to be used in the Constitution. To use his own words: "Indeed, the discipline of the House would be destroyed, its government would be in chaos, if the practice of breaking a quorum at will by the refusal of members to vote could not be suppresssed." And then he proceeds to prescribe the remedy to which allusion has already been made. He asserts that, as a refusal to vote constitutes disorderly conduct, and as the House has the power to punish the disorderly conduct of its members, the true remedy would be to inflict a fine upon every member present in the House who might refuse to vote upon a call of the roll. Instead of the rule adopted by the present House, he suggests the adoption of the following rule:

"Rule XV. If a member shall refuse to vote on a call of the *yeas* and *nays* after being requested by the Speaker to do so, he may be fined by the Speaker, not exceeding $50; and until said fine is paid said member shall not be allowed to take part in debate in the House or in Committee of the Whole, nor shall he be allowed to present any question of order to the Speaker."

In suggesting this rule, X. M. C. has completely turned his back on the constitutional provision which permits the House to compel the attendance of its members, and relies entirely upon the provision which empowers it to punish for disorderly conduct. It must be apparent to the mind of the most prejudiced critic of Speaker Reed, on a first reading of this rule, that X. M. C. does not suggest the means by which the House can itself compel a quorum, but, rather, the means by which it can avenge itself upon those who deprive it of a quorum. The constitutional privilege of the House is not confined to the mere power to punish a mem-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ber who does not attend its sittings. It embraces the right to compel his attendance, and in the exercise of this power its officer can take the body of the member from any place in which he may be found within the limits of the United States, and produce him at the bar of the House, and keep him within the chamber, subject to the direction and control of the House. This is a very much broader power than the mere right to punish for a failure to attend. The rule suggested by X. M. C. would therefore involve the use of the lesser power and the abandonment of the greater. It would not compel a quorum, nor make one, nor maintain one. Indeed, it might be an effective means of depriving the House of a quorum. If a member declined to pay the fine, what would be the result? He might be suspended. In that case the prospect of a quorum would be still more remote. He might be imprisoned, but as he could be detained in custody only during the existence of the Congress, his imprisonment would make it impossible to count him as of the quorum. In the last hours of the session, with party feeling aroused to a high pitch of excitement, the attempt of the House to maintain a quorum by the imposition of fines would result in a ludicrous failure either to assert its power or to preserve its dignity.

It is amazing that a logician so acute as X. M. C. appears to be should have been betrayed by the strength of his feeling into such a grievous and palpable error. The remedy suggested by X. M. C. is, in fact, no remedy at all. A remedy in law and in reason is something very different from a punishment. We may punish murder by death and larceny by imprisonment, but these punishments afford no remedy for the life which is lost or the property which has been abstracted. All moralists agree that it is the duty of society to prevent crime rather than to punish it, wherever prevention is possible. The very adoption of a penalty for wrong-doing is a confession that it is impossible to prevent the perpetration of the offence. If, therefore, the power of the House be reduced to the mere infliction of penalties for the breaking of a quorum, it is plain that it has no power to compel the existence of a quorum. But if we once concede that the House has no power to compel a quorum, the constitutional provision which empowers it to compel the attendance of members is absolutely valueless. X. M. C. relies upon the severity of the penalty to deter the members from practising this method of ob-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

struction. But here he himself appears to be willing to depend upon that doctrine of chances for trusting to which he so strongly reproves Speaker Reed. Rule XV. as it now exists at least gives the House the means of proceeding with its business, and makes it impossible to obstruct the discharge of parliamentary business by the mere device of silence. Rule XV. as X. M. C. proposes to make it might enlarge by a few hundred dollars the surplus in the Treasury, but it would not of itself enable the House to obtain and maintain a quorum.

X. M. C. is fond of illustrating by a hypothetical absurdity a position which he assails. Let us see how the rule which he proposes would work in a critical emergency through which the nation might be compelled to pass.

Suppose that this country were involved in a trying and doubtful war with a foreign or domestic enemy; that a considerable minority of the House of Representatives was in favor of settling the controversy upon terms which had been rejected by the judgment of the majority; that a measure was pending before Congress authorizing the government to borrow the moneys which were absolutely essential to the successful prosecution of the conflict, and that the measure was reached on the last day of the session. What would be the operation of Rule XV., as suggested by X. M. C., under these circumstances? Let us assume that 175 members were present, of whom ten were so bitterly opposed to a continuance of the contest that they were ready to adopt the parliamentary weapon of obstruction in order to force the government to a capitulation. These ten members remaining silent in their seats, the 165 members who were ready and anxious to vote the supplies necessary to enable the government to defend its existence would have, according to X. M. C., the right to close the doors of the House and keep the ten inside. They could order a call of the roll, and if the ten members remained silent, the 165 would be powerless to pass the legislation essential to the very existence of the government. True, the Speaker could impose a fine of $50 upon each of the recalcitrant members; the power of the House would then be exhausted and the government itself would be imperilled, if not destroyed.

We have seen the amusing conceit in which X. M. C. has indulged at the expense of Speaker Reed and of Rule XV.,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by assuming that the Speaker would send a letter to the President claiming that 90 members out of 166 would be sufficient to override his veto. Let us imagine the letter which a Speaker of the House might send to the President, under the circumstances which we have supposed, informing him of the failure of the House to pass the legislation requisite to secure the funds necessary for the defence of the country through the refusal of a small minority to answer a roll-call.

FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, March 4th, 1891.

TO THE PRESIDENT:

The bill, H. R. 1111, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow moneys necessary for the payment of our armies and for the purchase of munitions of war, was reached in the House to-day. One hundred and sixty-five members voted in favor of the bill—less than a quorum. Ten members who were present in the House, and who refused to vote, were each fined by me $50. The refusal of these 10 members to vote has deprived the House of a constitutional quorum, and the bill has therefore failed. While the failure of Congress to pass this legislation may force the government to conclude a peace upon any terms which the enemy may choose to dictate, the principle that a quorum can only be determined by the yeas and nays and the right of the House to punish recalcitrant members have both been fully vindicated. The country has been ruined, but the Treasury has gained $500.

Your obedient servant,
X. M. C., SPEAKER.

It may be urged that it is unfair to test the general practicability of a rule by its application to a particular day of the session. Let us, therefore, assume that the measure which we have supposed was reached during the middle of the session. In that case, the letter might be couched in the following terms:

FIFTY-FIRST CONGRESS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, May 1, 1892.

TO THE PRESIDENT:

The bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to borrow the moneys necessary to defray the expenses of the war in which the country is now engaged was reached in the House to-day. One hundred and sixty-five members voted in favor of the measure—less than a quorum. The measure has therefore failed to become a law. Ten members who were present in the House, and who refused to vote, were by me fined $50 each. They have refused to pay these fines, and they have been committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms. As it will be impossible to continue the defence of the capital, and as the enemy will naturally regard these ten members as his best friends, he will, in all probability, liberate them as soon as he shall have taken possession of the city. To keep them in custody it will therefore be necessary to conclude peace at the very earliest date. This is precisely what the ten recalcitrant members wish to accomplish. After the treaty shall have been signed, they will have no reason to persist in their contumacy, and they will, in all probability, pay their fines. There will, therefore, be reason for universal congratulation. The minority will have controlled the proceedings of Congress, and the majority will have collected $500, which may be applied to the payment of the indemnity exacted by our conquerors.

Your obedient servant,
X. M. C., SPEAKER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It will be seen that the very worst effect which X. M. C. has chosen to attribute to Rule XV. as it now exists falls far short of the disastrous results which would flow from a rigid adherence to his theory that a constitutional quorum can only be secured by the consent of a majority of all the members of the House to answer their names on the call of the roll. The principle that the House can be deprived of a quorum while it has the power to compel the attendance of its members is absolutely inadmissible, and would lead to conclusions more extravagant than any imagined by Gilbert. While the House unquestionably has the power to punish any conduct on the part of its members which is forbidden by its rules, it has also the undoubted power to secure a quorum and to preserve it.

But, it may be asked, is it not a dangerous innovation upon parliamentary usages to give the clerk of the House the power to count a quorum? Here we have the real ground upon which the position of Speaker Reed may be fairly criticised. The power to count a quorum is, indeed, a dangerous power to intrust to a servant of the House, and one which should never have been conferred upon him. Rule XV. is a salutary reform so far as it asserts the principle that a quorum consists of a majority of the members present in the House, whether voting or silent, and that the members present are presumptively present to do business. The method of ascertaining the presence of members under this rule is, however, entirely reprehensible. Under a parliamentary system which requires a majority to constitute a quorum, when the roll-call shows less than a majority voting, though a majority are clearly within the chamber, a system should be devised for ascertaining the number present which would leave nothing to vagueness or conjecture.

The quorum should be counted by the House, and not by the clerk or by the Speaker. The whole number present should be counted, and not the bare number necessary to make a quorum. When it is apparent that a quorum is actually present, while less than a quorum has voted, it is entirely competent and proper for the House to direct that the members who abstain from voting should be placed at the bar, and that in the presence of the whole House their attendance be noted and they themselves counted as of the quorum. Such a proceeding would remove any element

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of doubt as to the identity of the members constituting the quorum. Such a rule would not be inconsistent with the provisions of Rule VIII. as they now exist, nor with any additional clause which might be adopted providing a penalty for a failure to obey its provisions. It would operate to preserve a more accurate record of the proceedings than any which has been heretofore known to Congress, by showing for the benefit of their constituents which members voted, which failed to vote through non-attendance, and which refused to vote in open defiance of the rules.

The inevitable result of filibustering by minorities has been the extension of the power of the presiding officer. When a minority becomes obstructive, the majority usually retaliates by curtailing the privileges which have been abused. The Speaker is usually the instrument by which the purpose of the majority is accomplished. The business of the House is placed more completely under his control, so that he may afford the majority an opportunity to secure the passage of the legislation which it desires. The power of the Speakership has thus increased enormously, and its growth has been at the expense of the parliamentary privileges of the individual members. The rule which has been under discussion is a striking instance of this tendency to confide to the Speaker powers which should be properly exercised by the House itself. Properly speaking, the Speaker is but the servant of the House; the organ by which it speaks as a body; the hand by which it attests its proceedings; the medium by which it preserves order. To restrict his powers to the discharge of these functions would be the very highest type of parliamentary reform.

With the power of the House to maintain a quorum fully established, the minority will see the wisdom of restricting opposition to the legitimate limits of parliamentary contention. The obstructive tactics of silence will be abandoned, because they will have become useless, and all parties, it may be hoped, will combine to curtail the power of the Speakership, which has of late years grown to such proportions as to constitute a serious menace to the freedom, and even to the stability, of parliamentary institutions.

JUDEX.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

THE CASE OF THE CHIRICAHUAS.

THE Apaches, as a nation, were conquered by General George Crook in a series of campaigns lasting from 1871 to 1875. The Chiricahua and Warm Springs Apaches were, however, excepted from his control. In 1876 the scattered bands of this tribe were united with the San Carlos and White Mountain Apaches on the San Carlos Reservation. Friction between these several tribes and other causes resulted, in 1881 and 1882, in the departure or "breaking-out" of the Chiricahuas, who fled to their ancient haunts in the wild Sierras of Old Mexico.

General Crook, who had been sent north in 1875 to quiet the Sioux, was hastily ordered back to Arizona, and in the remarkable campaign of 1883 the Chiricahuas, more than 500 in number, were returned to the reservation as prisoners.

In May, 1885, a party numbering 134 again returned to Mexico. An arduous campaign ensued, resulting in the surrender of the whole party to General Crook in March, 1886. Geronimo and thirty-five others escaped while returning to the United States, but in accordance with the terms of the surrender, Chihuahua and seventy-six others were sent as prisoners to Fort Marion, Florida.

The operations against the hostile remnant were then intrusted to General Miles. Hampered by his orders from Washington, his campaign was foredoomed to failure. This fact becoming evident, it was determined to effect by negotiation what had been found impossible to accomplish by force of arms. The idea was conceived of securing a reservation in the Indian Territory, where the peaceable Chiricahuas, then in Arizona, and the prisoners at Fort Marion could be united. It was hoped that the promise of reunion with their tribe on such a reservation would prove a sufficient bait to induce the hostiles to surrender. On July 13, 1886, Lieutenant Gatewood and two friendly Chiricahuas were despatched with a message to the hostiles, and about the same time a delegation of friendly Chiricahuas was sent to Washington with a view of procuring their consent to their removal. The authorities in Washington were, apparently, not in accord with the views of General Miles, and, after receiving a promise that so long as they remained peaceful their interests would be looked after, the Indians were started back to Arizona. This action did not suit General Miles, and he telegraphed that their return might cause trouble, and urged that, as the military reasons were sufficient and the opportunity was favorable, some arrangement be made by which the tribe could be located outside of Arizona and New Mexico. The delegation was, therefore, held as prisoners at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

The Governor of Arizona then prepared a proclamation, offering a reward of $500 for the apprehension of Chatto, Loco, Kaetena, and several others of the delegation. The proclamation, though not issued, was not without its use. Chatto, the leading chief, was informed of its terms and was told that, if they returned to Arizona, the military would not protect them, but that they would be tried for acts done when on the war-path before the surrender to General Crook in 1883. At the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

same time an alternative proposition was submitted to them. This was, practically, that they should have a reservation in the Indian Territory near Fort Sill, where "the clear waters of the mountains, the climate, and the fertile soil would be congenial and beneficial to them. . . . Each family should have $100 worth of farming utensils and $200 worth of domestic stock the first year, and $300 worth of stock the second year." The whole tribe would be reunited, and some of them would serve as scouts, and would receive, some $50, some $20, a month.

To the Indian mind trial by the civil authorities meant simply being put to death by the whites. With such a threat hanging over them, there could be little doubt as to their decision. The alternative was accepted, and they agreed to go to the reservation so pleasantly described to them.

No authority, however, had been given to General Miles to make such an arrangement, wise as it doubtless was. He hoped perhaps for its subsequent approval by the War Department, but was informed that it was not possible at that time to procure the necessary legislation, and that all hope of doing so must be abandoned. He then urged the temporary removal of the Chiricahuas to New Mexico or Kansas, pending legislative action. To this General Sheridan replied that "the proposition to remove them to any reservation or military post west of the Missouri River cannot be entertained. The President wishes me to ask what you think of the proposition to forcibly arrest all on the reservation and send them to Fort Marion, Florida."

The hostiles had not yet surrendered, and the execution of such a scheme at that time would have proved fatal to General Miles's plans, and he replied that the objections were serious, as the Indians, having been sent to Washington to negotiate for removal to another reservation, "would consider it an act of bad faith"; and that "it would necessitate a war of extermination against those that are down in old Mexico, for *if banishment were the fate of those that have been peaceable*, they would expect theirs to be much worse, and I think all would have to be killed before any more would surrender."

Thus matters rested until August 24, when Lieutenant Gatewood succeeded in opening communication with the hostiles through the Chiricahua scouts, and General Miles's message was delivered to them. After discussing it more than two days, they decided to accept the terms offered them, and on September 6 Geronimo's band formally surrendered, with the understanding that no harm should come to them for their past offences, that they should join their tribe on a separate reservation, and that they should have farms and cattle of their own. The party, numbering fifteen men and seventeen women and children, were, however, sent to Fort Pickens, Florida.

The reasons for the removal of the peaceable Indians no longer existed, but the idea having once been suggested, the territorial press demanded its accomplishment. Originally a clever device to secure the surrender of the hostiles, and of importance only in that connection, the removal of the friendly Indians became a point insisted upon aside from any other consideration. It had been decreed that they could not be removed to any point in the west, and it was finally decided to send them to Florida, as the readiest means of disposing of them. Geronimo surrendered on September 6, and on the 20th of the same month 278 adult Indians and 103 children were received as prisoners at Fort Marion, where the delegation at Fort Leavenworth was sent to join them. In May, 1888, the whole tribe was united at Mount Vernon Barracks, Alabama, where it still remains.

Owing to change of climate, enforced idleness, and other causes, many have died. Up to November, 1889, the number of deaths was 119—a death-rate of nearly 25 per cent. in three years.

Of the whole tribe, Chihuahua's band alone was justly confined in Florida. The remainder, excepting Geronimo's band, were imprisoned without their consent and without just cause. General Miles says: "The assent of the band was given before they were really moved out of that country"; and Governor Wolfeley states that "they agreed to go east. So when they were sent east, it was under no false proposition." They consented to go to a reservation outside of Arizona: they never consented to confinement within the damp prison-walls of Fort Marion.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The whole number sent east in 1886 was 498. Of this number *less than twenty men were engaged in hostilities* during the whole of General Miles's campaign. For the sins of these few a sentence of banishment was visited upon the whole tribe. They were far from deserving it. On the contrary, General Miles refers to "their good conduct and loyalty." They had committed no crime against the government, but had done good work in its service. Many of them were scouts in General Crook's campaigns; some were retained in service by General Miles. In the records is found frequent mention of their gallantry and fortitude. They wore out the white troops in the field, and were pushed on alone far into the Sierra Madres, and under the gallant Crawford, rendered effective aid in securing the surrender in March, 1886. In the mountains, over desert plains, marching through mud and through shallow alkali lakes that blistered their feet and legs, and "so foot-sore that it was only with great pain that they could travel at all," these Chiricahuas were ever "the most subordinate, energetic, untiring, and by odds the most efficient" of the scouts. Honorably discharged from the military service, they returned to their reservation, where, one day, they were brought together "to be counted." They were surrounded by soldiers and other Apaches, and placed on a train, "ten car-loads of them." When they alighted, they were exiles and prisoners. Three hundred and eighty-one of them were confined in Fort Marion, where there was room for "seventy-five men, women, and children, in addition to those already there." They were placed on the same footing as the hostiles. Even the two scouts by whose aid the surrender of Geronimo was effected were imprisoned with the rest.

Thus, for the sake of less than twenty, a whole tribe of nearly 400 innocent people have been condemned to exile and imprisonment, which to many of them have meant death.

L. W. V. KENNON.

II.

STANLEY'S PYGMIES.

AMONG the many wonderful things Stanley has to reveal to us, the pygmies of the Aruwhimie forest are not the least, if we may judge by the hushed eagerness with which eight thousand people listened to the description he recently gave before the Geographical Society in the Albert Hall. True, he tells us little in his speeches, but what he tells us is enough to awaken the keenest curiosity to know more of what must be the most marvellous scene now existing in the world.

Over a country about half as large as France, covered with huge trees,—ten thousand million of them is Stanley's own calculation, and standing so thick that it is always twilight below their interwoven branches,—wandering in thousands, as they have wandered for ages, are to be found a race of light-brown men and women scarcely four feet high. Three thousand years ago, long before Herodotus, the father of history, was born, they retreated before larger races, as the Lapps, who are nearly as diminutive, retreated before the Norsemen, and in the course of centuries they have so fitted themselves to their surroundings that the dreary forest, where full light never falls, has become to them their world—their paradise—limitless and vast, and it is beyond their power to think of emerging from its protecting gloom. They know nothing beyond it, even of tradition; have no idea of even a moderate expanse of open country; have never seen grass growing in quantities, and have no conception of any land without dense forest. The only open spaces they know are the little patches that have been cleared by a larger race for the cultivation of bananas, which in that luxuriant climate reach maturity in twelve months, and of which these little people are very fond. This pygmy race know their forests as thoroughly as our Indians know theirs, and by an inherited instinct, marvellous to the white man, track their way by day or night through the wilderness with a certainty and celerity which make them, despite their insignificant stature, a formidable foe. They appear to sustain life, like some other savage tribes, on roots and wild fruit, and can tell exactly what is poisonous and what is edible; but their chief dainty is the banana, and their desire for this luxury draws them irre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sistibly from the depths of their seclusion to the borders of the cultivated spots, where the larger race have shown their superior skill in growing this coveted fruit. They are, Stanley tells us, in their own way intelligent, possess a language, and, as we have just mentioned, have a minute knowledge of their forest intricacies, and can, when they please, make themselves dangerous, appearing and disappearing as suddenly, and almost as silently, as the very snakes themselves.

We can well believe that they retarded Stanley's advance more than all the tribes he met with of the usual size. These diminutive creatures are distinctly human in their enmities, friendships, virtues, and vices, and, withal, possess a certain force of character which has enabled them to remain undefeated by the circumstances around them throughout the historic life of man; and yet, notwithstanding their human characteristics, they live almost the life of baboons, and will doubtless continue to do so until the white man covets their rich timber land, which now seems limitless, and begins the work of felling the forest which is their home, and which, if antiquity of possession can constitute a title, is and always has been theirs.

D. KINMOUNT ROY.

III.

LITERARY BITTERS.

TO THE large army of worthy people who do not like medicine and object on principle to stimulants, while feeling a strong yearning for one or both, there came, long ago, a benefactor of his species with an invention, a compromise, a boon, which he called a tonic. The tonic, disguised under various names, was compounded in certain proportions of a bitter ingredient, a sweet one, and a large infusion of raw rum. It filled, as the inventor happily remarked, a long-felt want. Those who needed medicine found, or—which is the same thing—thought they found, it in the bitter element. Those whose systems craved a stimulant found that, too, without having to sully their feet and contaminate their souls by entering a dram-shop. The tonic, as a beverage and a blessing, had "come to stay."

The literary tonic has also come, we fear, to remain permanently. Good people who would as soon drink rum as read fiction are the best patrons of the new stimulant—the novel with a purpose. They read it, as they will assure you, solely for its moral, not for its story. Therein they show a glimmering of good taste, for, in sober truth, the fictional element of the novel with a purpose, like the alcoholic element of the tonic, is usually of the poorest quality to be found in the mental laboratory. Other people, not so good, read it from the opposite motive. They, being unregenerate, but not wholly abandoned, feel that they ought to take spiritual medicine of some sort, and, being unable to swallow their theology "straight," they compound by taking it with an admixture of fiction. Between the two, the novel with a purpose enjoys a wide popularity; both classes of readers being zealous advertisers of the nostrum, from different motives. The good party recommends it for its religious tone; the less good for its alleged literary merits and, vaguely, because it grapples with so many doubtful and controverted questions.

There is a third party, corresponding to the unblushing consumer of material stimulants, who wants his fiction pure and simple, either totally without purpose, or with its purpose so skilfully disguised by a master-chemist, like Dickens, that he never tastes it and only feels its good effects indirectly. Curiously enough, both of the other classes like to pitch upon him as an erring brother to be worked with on behalf of the literary tonic. It never occurs to them that he may be feeling healthy enough to need no medicine. "Have you read 'Robert Elsmere'?" they ask. "Oh, you must—it expresses so many yearnings and doubts of the soul." Or, "You must read Tolstoï's 'Kreutzer Sonata'; it is *risqué* here and there, but it teaches such a lesson."

Now, I make bold to confess that I have read neither of these tonic works, nor many others equally well recommended by worthy people who are willing to have their portraits printed "before and after taking." I began both on compulsion, being a free American citizen bound to obey the behests of my neighbors. I lost a good friend when I sent back her "Elsmere," after enjoying seven chapters and, I think,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

five tea-parties therein chronicled; but I made, by way of compensation, a new enemy when I returned the "Sonata," confessing that its nastiness did not atone for its dulness. I weakly temporized with a third friend by wading through "Diana of the Crossways" and frankly saying that I had found it verbose and tedious to the last degree.

Why cannot the good and the semi-good leave us—the bad—alone in our iniquity? We don't go telling them they must read Scott and Dickens and Thackeray, not to mention such purposeless and moralless authors as Dumas and Cooper and Reade and Collins, and all the purveyors of pure stimulants. Genuine fiction does not need any "booming." Why must we, who have our own normal appetites, be adjured on every rock and dead-wall to "ask your druggist for" a poor brand of liquor masquerading as a literary bitters? There should be a Society for the Protection of Mental Scenery against the desecration of the advertising artist.

JAMES JEFFREY ROCHE.

IV.

A PLEA FOR PEDANTS.

WHY is it that pedants are generally so ridiculed? Is it not lucky for a man that he *can* contract an intense, even an extravagant, fondness for some pursuit,—some specific study, art, or science,—which he will consequently understand better than other men, and in solving whose problems he may become an expert? What is a man good for without professional enthusiasm,—who does not give his whole soul to his calling, concentrating upon it all his energies, and loving it with an ardor that almost ignores the existence of any other? "No man," says Emerson, "can do anything well, who does not think that what he does is the centre of the visible universe." It is easy to declaim against "one-ideaism," "intellectual narrowness," and "a' that"; but, in spite of the cheap eloquence and fashionable cant of superficially-omniscient men who plume themselves upon their fancied oceanic breadth and depth, we love to see a man magnify his calling, even if he does overrate its relative importance. It is only thus that he can achieve excellence or eminence.

Who are the men that make their mark on the world, and to what do they owe their celebrity and influence? Are they the men who have the most versatility and the most varied culture? No; they are those whose minds want balance, who have some giant faculty developed at the expense of the rest. The very deadness of perception thus induced promotes self-confidence and positiveness. Occasionally, at long intervals in the history of humanity, a person appears who wings his flight to the peaks of greatness by an equal flapping of his wings; but all the rest gain their motion like a mill-wheel—by a continued fall of water on one side. The want of balance, it has been truly said, is the cause of most motion, and therefore the minds that stir the stagnant pool of common thought are out of equilibrium, and propelled by this very cause, like a pith figure loaded with a leaden foot, to spring with impatient yet effective force in some providentially-prescribed direction. Once in four or five centuries the world beholds a Leonardo da Vinci or a Leibnitz; but few of their fellow-mortals can fully master more than one art or science,—all beyond is a miserable affectation and a downright waste of time. What Michael Angelo said of painting is true of every other art or craft,—"It is jealous, and requires the whole man."

The day of universal scholars is past. The measure of a man's learning to-day is the amount of his voluntary ignorance; the measure of his practical force is the amount he is content to leave unattempted. We cannot, therefore, admire the man who, instead of being devoted to one great art,—"married to that immortal bride,"—woos all the muses in turn; not content to be a painter, sculptor, or writer, unless he is also "chemist, statesman, fiddler, and buffoon." There is no end of acquisition, if one begins to dabble in all the *ologies* and *isms* which may be intrinsically valuable, or which, if possessed, may add a feather to his reputation. Give us a thousand times, rather, the glorious pedantry of Fielding's Parson Adams, who thought a schoolmaster the greatest character in the world, and himself the greatest schoolmaster in it! We smile when we are told of the French grammarian, Dagues-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

seau, who, when told that a revolution had broken out in Paris, replied, "Never mind; I have in my portfolio thirty-six conjugations, all completed"; and, again, when we hear of Dr. George, who shrewdly suspected that Frederic the Great, with all his victories, could not conjugate a Greek verb in *mi*. But this very exclusiveness—this absorption in one pursuit—is the secret of all power. Was Vestris, the French dancing-master, guilty of coxcombry or falsehood in declaring that Voltaire and himself were the two greatest men in all Europe? No, assuredly; he but manifested a proper feeling of enthusiasm for his art, and it would have been downright hypocrisy for him to have pretended to think otherwise.

Sydney Smith, in satirizing the classical education at the English universities, says that "the Parr or the Bentley of his day would be scandalized to be put on a level with the discoverer of a neutral salt." And why not, prithee? Can we expect a great scholar, who has devoted a life to his calling to deem any other of equal rank and importance? Shall a painter be required to feel the same admiration for the works of Mozart and Handel as for those of Raphael and Titian? Why should *not* the Greek or Latin scholar, who has "scorned delights and lived laborious days" to possess himself of those stubborn tongues, "glory in the detection of an anapest in the wrong place, or in the restoration of a dative case which Cranzius has passed over, and the never-dying Ernesti failed to observe"? What if a grammarian *does* "tower and plume himself," as Sir Thomas Browne says that he has known one to do, "over a line of Horace, and show more pride in the construction of one ode than the author in the composure of the whole book"? We see nothing ridiculous in this; it is but the natural result of a passionate and absorbing love for one's pursuit.

We are told of Baron Masères, with whom the study of abstract arithmetic was a passion, that his leading idea seemed to have been to calculate more decimal places than any one could possibly want, and to print the works of all who had done the same thing. What mathematician ever signally distinguished himself whose devotion to his science was not thus exclusive? Who would employ in a great suit a lawyer who does not bristle all over with *nolle prosequis* and *certioraris* and *surrebutters*, and shed tears of admiration over his Coke upon Littleton and his Fearne on "Contingent Remainders"? It is only the blockhead or hypocrite who never goes crazy with enthusiasm. "A London apprentice who did not admire the Lord Mayor's coach," says Hazlitt, "would stand a good chance of coming to be hanged." In short, to excel greatly in any profession there should be an exclusiveness, a bigotry, a blindness of attachment to it, which will make every other seem insignificant in comparison.

The world holds the same view. It will not believe in the depth of a many-sided man. To what but this were due the doubt and detraction which dogged Bulwer all his days? Had he been a novelist only, instead of being the "Admirable Crichton" of letters,—novelist, essayist, satirist, dramatist, poet, historian, orator,—he would have held a far higher and more undisputed place in the literary Walhalla. It was said by Jules Janin of Édouard Fournier: "*Cet homme là sait tout; il ne sait que cela; mais il le sait bien*"; yet Fournier, in spite of his encyclopædic culture, is an obscure man of letters.

Even when it is shown in a reprehensible calling, one cannot but admire an absorbing enthusiasm. Froissart, in his "Chronicles," tells of a reverend monk who had been a robber in his early life, and who, growing old, used pathetically to lament that he had ever changed his profession. He said "it was a goodly sight to sally out from his castle, and to see a troop of jolly friars come riding that way, with their mules well laden with viands and rich stores, to advance toward them, to attack and overthrow them, returning to the castle with a noble booty." Even the veriest villain, if he be a consummate villain, must be more content and better pleased with himself than his half-faced counterfeit; and this simply through his force and determination of character. We should have, too, more hope of reclaiming him and making him a blessing to the world, than of reforming the cold, heartless block of a scoundrel in whom to kindle enthusiasm for anything, good or bad, would be like "creating a soul under the ribs of death."

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED